

Philip P. Voran, Kinsley, Kans., in place of W. C. Reeder, resigned.
 Caleb A. Budmer, Natoma, Kans., in place of A. V. Hoskins, not commissioned.
 May B. Lawson, Plains, Kans., in place of N. W. Woodworth, transferred.
 Clifford I. Percival, Smolan, Kans. Office became Presidential October 1, 1942.
 G. Lowell Kelley, White Cloud, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

KENTUCKY

James A. Usher, Farmington, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Elizabeth Godsey, Hardburly, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 James L. Howard, Kings Mountain, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Mary H. Buckler, Loretto, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Arnold E. Adkins, Raceland, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Thelma Chice Howard, Summer Shade, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

LOUISIANA

Willie A. Dearman, Delhi, La., in place of J. W. Stegall, transferred.
 Edith W. Ott, Fisher, La., in place of F. H. Wootton, resigned.
 Anatole E. Ayo, Jr., Lockport, La., in place of Conrad Bourgeois. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.
 Pauline M. Netterville, Newellton, La., in place of A. B. Netterville. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1942.

MAINE

Verna G. Clark, Albion, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Lester G. Sands, Bar Mills, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Katherine C. Duntley, Casco, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MARYLAND

Emma B. Gardner, Arnold, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 William E. Bowman, Silver Spring, Md., in place of Howard Griffith, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

Hester L. Sherman, Brimfield, Mass., in place of J. W. Brown, deceased.

MISSOURI

Stephen H. Biggerstaff, Wheeling, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MONTANA

David R. Bowen, Worden, Mont., in place of D. R. Bowen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEBRASKA

George W. Lincoln, Lexington, Nebr., in place of P. J. Hewitt. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEVADA

William Harold Morgan, Yerington, Nev., in place of E. M. Booth, removed.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Edward Reilly, Dover, N. H., in place of J. J. Cavanaugh, removed.
 Walter E. French, Dublin, N. H., in place of F. B. Farley, resigned.

Julia W. Blair, Fitzwilliam, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

George G. Helsing, New Ipswich, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ralph E. Avery, West Campton, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW JERSEY

Almira C. Goff, Bridgeport, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Edna M. Bowen, Franklin Park, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Thomas L. Hunt, Greystone Park, N. J., in place of W. J. Dugan, removed.

Lena McCain, Hope, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

LXXXIX—686

NEW YORK

Clyde M. Johengen, Collins, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Charles J. Jones, Garnerville, N. Y., in place of F. P. Morstatt, deceased.

Mary T. Mushler, Rocky Point, N. Y., in place of A. R. Cardona, resigned.

Anne N. Cislter, Stillwater, N. Y., in place of W. H. Nolan, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Clara C. Craven, Trinity, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OHIO

James E. Rosser, McArthur, Ohio, in place of J. E. Warren, deceased.

Albert N. Weckerly, Whitehouse, Ohio, in place of D. K. Studer, resigned.

OREGON

Gertrude K. McKinney, Elkton, Oreg., in place of A. R. McDonald, resigned.

Dorothy V. Elliott, Florence, Oreg., in place of E. L. Basford, resigned.

Clinton F. Trow, Ontario, Oreg., in place of C. F. Cox, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Jane F. Mackley, Bainbridge, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Arthur R. Lovell, Blandburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Besse C. Pfeffer, Boiling Springs, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Donald A. Noll, Bowmanstown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Beulah McConnell, Clinton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Julia M. Fuleki, Commodore, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Catherine Matlock, Cumbola, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Kermit E. Reisenweaver, Drums, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Walter R. Weir, Floreffe, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Charles W. Staley, Plymouth Meeting, Pa., in place of E. A. Howell, resigned.

Walter C. Starinshak, Ranshaw, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lafayette Lawrence, Renfrew, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Arzella A. Plummer, Sidman, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Frank O. Shenton, Slatedale, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Katherine M. Evans, Springville, Pa., in place of M. L. Lake, resigned.

Grace E. Strattan, Strattanville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ruth A. Groover, Upper Black Eddy, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Emma E. Foster, Wall, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Elizabeth N. Nolt, Willow Street, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

PUERTO RICO

Angel Socorro, Caguas, P. R., in place of Augustin Carbonell, retired.

Tomas S. Gutierrez, San Sebastian, P. R., in place of J. V. Hernandez, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Grover C. Henderson, Greenwood, S. C., in place of G. N. Burnett. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1942.

James N. Cleveland, Marietta, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Thomas M. Moore, Rembert, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Clarence R. Dregseth, Baltic, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Alton B. Nelson, Toronto, S. Dak., in place of O. I. Ohman. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

TENNESSEE

Edgar M. Quisenberry, Atoka, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mattie Ida O'Brien, Christiana, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

TEXAS

Claud S. Campbell, Borger, Tex., in place of J. E. Morris, resigned.

Thomas L. P. Lindley, Fairfield, Tex., in place of Lonnie Childs, retired.

Stella Gliddon, Johnson City, Tex., in place of C. C. Redford, retired.

Fannie E. Taylor, Murchison, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Marion J. Edwards, Rankin, Tex., in place of A. J. Bushong, retired.

Robert E. Johnson, Round Rock, Tex., in place of J. W. Ledbetter, transferred.

UTAH

Etta Moffitt, Kenilworth, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

VERMONT

Marjorie B. Carroll, Graniteville, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Olive M. Lobdell, Hartland, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

George E. Lee, Pawlet, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

VIRGINIA

Russell D. Davis, Axton, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Cecil I. Bruce, Bastian, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WASHINGTON

John H. Thompson, Midway, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Roy W. Peterson, Parkland, Wash., in place of A. R. Lehmann, deceased.

Fred Kelly, Woodinville, Wash., in place of L. M. Crim, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA

Gaylord Smith, Ellenboro, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Dallas R. Yeager, Mason, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 18 (legislative day of December 15, 1943):

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS

Ray H. Vanderhook	Paul W. Lucas
William D. King	William J. McAnally
Roy E. Wolfe	Clarence K. Aldrich
Clarence B. Mayes	Steve F. Price
William B. Hoover	

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Alexander A. Vandegrift to be Commandant of the Marine Corps with the rank of Lieutenant general for a period of 4 years from January 1, 1944.

Merritt A. Edson to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from December 1, 1943.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, infinite in power and wisdom, we trust that we approach Thee in the spirit of humility and in the consciousness of our needs. We pray that our demeanor and our influence may reflect the teaching of the Man of Nazareth,

realizing that nothing finally wrong can live.

Bless and guide our citizens of every station; grant that labor and industry may be so bound together that they may come to that unity and cooperation which forbids intolerance and any sort of idleness. The Lord God help us all to be grim fighters for the truth, for individual freedom, and for the rights of man wherever he may live—"Never strike sail to fear. Come into port greatly, or sail with God the seas."

Heavenly Father, as we approach the fore-glow of the Advent season, may we hear Thy call, not as a ruler summons his underlings but as a father calls his child. O let us hear that voice in tones of cheer and love, in hope and gladness. As we gather about our encircled tables may we know that they have been purchased by midnight vigils, by parental strivings, and are being wrought on the battle fronts of freedom. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on December 17, 1943, the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On December 17, 1943:

- H. R. 247. An act for the relief of the estate of Richard Dodge Beale, deceased;
- H. R. 302. An act for the relief of Robert Griffin;
- H. R. 937. An act for the relief of the estate of Luther Clyde Nanny;
- H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Clare A. Miller;
- H. R. 1379. An act for the relief of Gerald Estell Proctor;
- H. R. 1640. An act for the relief of Mrs. J. D. Price;
- H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of Ronald A. Cox;
- H. R. 1973. An act for the relief of Albert Ferguson and Ozelle Ferguson;
- H. R. 2080. An act to provide temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service;
- H. R. 2188. An act to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes;
- H. R. 2190. An act for the relief of Marguerite R. McElroy;
- H. R. 3039. An act for the relief of Mrs. C. W. Selby;
- H. R. 3070. An act to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes;
- H. R. 3299. An act for the relief of Victor H. Loftus, disbursing clerk, American Embassy, Mexico, D. F., Mexico;
- H. R. 3309. An act to suspend temporarily the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;
- H. R. 3363. An act extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made.
- H. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright; and
- H. J. Res. 176. Joint resolution to provide for the proper observance of the one hun-

dred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) entitled "Joint resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. THOMAS of Idaho to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COUNSEL

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 386) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas section 304 of the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943 (Public Law 132) provides:

"No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used, after November 15, 1943, to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett, unless prior to such date such person has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for leaves of absence or salary, or of any refund or reimbursement, which have accrued prior to November 15, 1943: *Provided further*, That this section shall not operate to deprive such person of payment for services performed as a member of a jury or as a member of the armed forces of the United States nor any benefit, pension, or emolument resulting therefrom"; and

Whereas the President of the United States did not appoint Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., or Robert Morss Lovett by and with the advice and consent of the Senate prior to November 15, 1943; and

Whereas said Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett have pretended to render service as employees of the United States Government since November 15, 1943; and

Whereas the said Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett, respectively, have filed petitions in the Court of Claims of the United States in separate proceedings entitled "Goodwin B. Watson, plaintiff, versus the United States, defendant; William E. Dodd, Jr., plaintiff, versus the United States, defendant; and Robert Morss Lovett, plaintiff, versus the United States, defendant"; and

Whereas the said plaintiffs in said proceeding ask to recover compensation alleged to be due them prior to the time of the commencement of said proceedings on account of services alleged to have been rendered to the United States; and

Whereas said proceedings are now pending in the Court of Claims of the United States; and

Whereas the Attorney General of the United States in communications addressed

to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Vice President of the United States has indicated that the Congress should be afforded an opportunity to be represented by their own counsel; and

Whereas the House of Representatives has a specific interest in the subject matter of said proceedings due to the fact that the matter originated by virtue of action of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the special subcommittee heretofore appointed by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, pursuant to House Resolution 105, Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby authorized to appoint counsel to represent the United States in the Court of Claims and in any appellate proceedings resulting therefrom in the actions now pending in said Court of Claims heretofore referred to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXPENSES OF SPECIAL COUNSEL, ETC.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 387) providing for the expenses in connection with the resolution just agreed to and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That (1) the expenses incurred pursuant to House Resolution 386, Seventy-eighth Congress, including compensation of counsel appointed pursuant thereto and expenses of the litigation referred to therein; and (2) the expenses of such further proceedings as may be conducted under House Resolution 105, Seventy-eighth Congress, not to exceed \$15,000 in the aggregate, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of the special subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations appointed pursuant to House Resolution 105, Seventy-eighth Congress, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit another privileged resolution (H. Res. 389) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 282 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, and continued under House Resolution 26 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, House Resolution 321 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, House Resolution 90 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, House Resolution 420 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and House Resolution 65 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, incurred by the special committee appointed to investigate un-American activities in the United States and related questions, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$7,500 in addition to sums heretofore made available, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants,

shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. As I understand, this resolution provides enough money to keep the committee going until the chairman has had an opportunity to present the facts before the gentleman's committee?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes, the committee requested the chairman to appear, but he was unable to be here. There is a balance of \$3,000. For salaries for the month of December alone, the amount is \$4,695. This does not include the expenses of the committee. There is something around \$4,000 in bills for expenses that have not been submitted. They are being withheld although I have urged they be sent in so we would know just what the balance is from week to week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is to keep it going until the gentleman has had an opportunity to inquire fully into the matter?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes, this is to keep the committee going, to pay the employees money they have earned. The committee has asked the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] to appear before it not later than January 15 and advised him no additional money will be appropriated until he appears and justifies the appropriation, as well as explain expenditures. That is the usual procedure.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Can the gentleman inform the House how much money has already been appropriated for that committee?

Mr. COCHRAN. There has been appropriated all together since this committee was originally authorized by the House several Congresses ago about \$575,000, of which \$3,000 remains unexpended, but if the outstanding bills were paid now there would be a small deficit rather than \$3,000 to their credit. This \$7,500 and the \$3,000 gives them \$10,500 to run during December and January.

Mr. SABATH. Was any evidence presented to the gentleman's committee of the work these gentlemen are doing who are on the pay roll of this committee and what activities they are engaged in and whether it is necessary to continue to keep them on the pay roll and to continue this expenditure when the money is needed for more important purposes?

Mr. COCHRAN. The only witness before the committee was the secretary of the committee who gave us a list of the employees and stated that six or seven employees had left the committee in the last few months. He stated that the committee yesterday voted to make an investigation in reference to orders issued by the Civil Service Commission relative to investigations of applicants

for positions. The committee has just closed a hearing in reference to the Japanese situation. Outside of that, the committee has been engaged in co-operating with the Military Intelligence, Naval Intelligence, and the F. B. I. by furnishing them their records relative to various individuals that those organizations are investigating.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman recognizes that we have no quarrel, and even if a call of the House were ordered, and I do not intend to make a motion of that kind, it would perhaps do no good, because if there are men who have been working and who have not been paid I am in favor of their being paid. If the resolution is for that purpose, of course, I shall not object.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman that I am acting at the direction of the committee of which I am chairman. I will say, also, that I share in his views, the employees should be paid, but so far as I am concerned, I will welcome the day when this committee will go out of business. It has done some good work but other agencies are investigating subversive activities every day. The House as a whole, after the gentleman from Illinois' committee, reported a resolution passed it continuing this committee's activities for the present Congress. After that was done, it was and is the duty of the Committee on Accounts to provide expenses. I want to hold the expenses down as much as we possibly can and I want the chairman to come in before the committee and justify his request for additional expenses and explain its activities.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield, for a question.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that the membership of the House does not entertain his views which he expressed a moment ago, nor do they entertain the views of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] relative to the Dies committee. The Dies committee has rendered wonderful service to the American people. It is so well known to the Members of Congress, it is so well known to the F. B. I., it is so well known to the Army, it is so well known to the Navy, it is so well known to the people of this country who are interested in keeping down subversive elements, that I do not think it is necessary for the Dies committee to come in with witnesses and offer proof as to the necessity of continuing it at this time.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the Committee on Accounts has the same right to call witnesses before it as his Committee on World War Veterans Legislation. We are trying to do our work in a proper way and we want to do it right.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand that the majority of the committee voted for this resolution and if the gentleman from Illinois wants to call the roll we would welcome it, because we will pass the resolution overwhelmingly.

Mr. COCHRAN. I voted for the resolution myself because it is to pay employees who have done work.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. What I would like to know is just what this money is for?

Mr. COCHRAN. It is to pay employees that are on the pay roll now and working, their salaries for the month of December and part of January.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Was there not an unexpended balance that could have covered that?

Mr. COCHRAN. The unexpended balance is \$3,000, which is not sufficient to meet the December pay roll. The question involved is, Do you want to pay the employees' salaries for the work they have been performing during the month of December?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am not opposed to paying the salaries of people who have been working, but I am opposed to using this resolution as an opening wedge for more funds for this Dies committee. I want to state on the record that I am opposed to this resolution and shall vote against it.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. FOLGER. I want to ask the gentleman if this will commit the House to anything except to pay what is already owed? I want to be done with this committee and have it ended.

Mr. COCHRAN. No; I cannot commit the House as to future action. It does provide for more money than is needed to pay the December salary, but these people will continue to work in January.

Mr. FOLGER. Will that have any effect on any other motion that may come in here to continue this committee?

Mr. COCHRAN. You will not have a motion to continue the committee because the committee has already been continued for this entire Congress.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. I did not quite grasp the gentleman's answer which he gave me originally as to the activities. Have you stated they will now investigate the civil service? And do you think, under the House resolution, the House gave them any such power? We have a special committee, the committee of which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] is chairman, who has been given that power and he has been doing a mighty good job. He has secured the elimination from the pay rolls, if I am not mistaken, as he last stated, of over 125,000 people. Now, that shows he has accomplished something, and he has not asked for any such vast sums of money. If this money is needed to be paid to these employees, all well and good, and I disagree with the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. As the question involved applies to subversive activities of applicants for positions with the Government, the committee certainly has

jurisdiction. I might also say the Ram-speak committee likewise has jurisdiction.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE REPORT ON INVESTIGATION OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 972) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Res. 330) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the second intermediate report (H. Rept. No. 862) of the Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That 7,000 additional copies of the second intermediate report (H. Rept. No. 862) of the Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies be printed for the use of said committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE REVENUE ACT OF 1943

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 970) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Res. 359) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the bill entitled "The Revenue Act of 1943," together with the accompanying report thereon, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed 2,000 additional copies of the bill entitled "The Revenue Act of 1943," for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives; and that 8,600 additional copies of the report (H. Rept. No. 371) thereon be printed, of which 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the House document room, 500 copies for the use of the Senate document room, 3,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and 100 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS RELATIVE TO RAILROAD REORGANIZATION

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 971) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Res. 384) authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings on the bill (H. R. 2857) to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said subcommittee during the current session on the bill (H. R. 2857) to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR CONFERENCE AT MOSCOW

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Report No. 973) back favorably a privileged resolution (H. Res. 370) authorizing that House Document No. 351, being the press releases of the Department of State containing the declaration of four nations on general security, pledging themselves to united action for the prosecution of the present war against their enemies, which was signed at the conference held at Moscow, Russia, together with other papers relating thereto, be reprinted with corrections conforming to the official texts now on file in the Department of State, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That House Document No. 351, current session, being the press releases of the Department of State containing the declaration of four nations on general security, pledging themselves to united action for the prosecution of the present war against their enemies, and recognizing the necessity for the eventual establishment of a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security, which was signed at the conference held at Moscow, Russia, by the Foreign Secretaries of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union, and the Chinese Ambassador at Moscow, together with the Anglo-Soviet-American communiqué, and the declarations regarding Italy and Austria issued by the three Foreign Secretaries at Moscow, and the declaration by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin regarding atrocities, be reprinted with the necessary corrections required to make the document conform to the original official texts now on file in the Department of State.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUISITION AND DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY REQUIRED FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE (H. DOC. NO. 367)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am submitting herewith to the Congress a report of operations for the pe-

riod April 16, 1943, through October 15, 1943, under the act of October 16, 1941, as amended, which authorized the President to requisition and dispose of property required for national defense.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 18, 1943.

ERECTION OF MEMORIAL AND ENTOMBMENT OF BODIES IN THE ARLINGTON MEMORIAL AMPHITHEATER (H. DOC. NO. 368)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the requirements of the Public Act No. 397, Sixty-sixth Congress, I transmit herewith the annual report of the Commission on the Erection of Memorials and Entombment of Bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 18, 1943.

SIXTIETH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the act of Congress to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States approved January 16, 1883, I transmit herewith the sixtieth annual report of the Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 18, 1943.

THE WRIGHT BROTHERS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, December 17, marked the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight. The people of North Carolina, led by the Governor of the State, had prepared exercises to be held at Kill Devil Hill, on the coast of North Carolina in Dare County commemorating this great event. Unfortunately the weather prevailed against the great State of North Carolina and the people, and the exercises necessarily had to be canceled, due to an unprecedented sleet and snow storm. As chairman of the arrangement committee I invited to these exercises the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JEFFREY], who has the honor to represent the district that Mr. Wright lives in. There had also been invited the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRIFFITHS], the North Carolina

delegation, and certain other Members of Congress. It was a great disappointment.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, there was held in Washington an outstanding event, a great banquet given in honor of Mr. Wright—the first aviator. The plane now in England is to be returned to America, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, it will be placed at Kitty Hawk, in the monument commemorating this great accomplishment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks an address made by the Honorable Lindsey C. Warren, the Comptroller General of the United States, a former Member of this House. At a future date, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the address which would have been given by the Governor of North Carolina at Kitty Hawk, be also included in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk Senate Joint Resolution 103 continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, with a House amendment, that the House insist on its amendment and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. SPENCE, Mr. FORD, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GIFFORD, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Dr. C. S. Longacre at the Masonic Temple in Detroit, Mich., under date of December 11.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial on our distinguished colleague the gentleman from North Carolina, Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on two subjects, one including an article on the Bonneville Dam

and the other including a certain resolution adopted in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of other special orders, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

INDUCTION OF MEN INTO THE ARMED FORCES DURING THE CHRISTMAS SEASON

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that boys who were inducted into the Army of the United States under the Selective Service System on December 1, 2, and 3 are about to be taken from their homes into the camps of the Army on the very eve of Christmas. I have addressed a communication on this subject and have talked in person to the proper Army authorities and have asked them to defer until after Christmas the actual transportation of these men from their homes to the camps for this reason. Many of these men are fathers of small children. It seems an unnecessarily inhumane thing at this time on the very eve of Christmas to take these men from their families of small children and put them into the Army of the United States. Certainly 2 or 3 days' postponement of the actual date of the transfer of these men will not materially affect the training of these men or the cause of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

RECESS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order that any time during the day for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does that provide for interruption of the program? I notice there are some special orders.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That will be subject to the order of the Speaker, of course.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not think they want to interrupt any special orders. This is simply to provide for a recess while we may wait on the Senate for some action.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize all Members who have special orders before he declares any recess.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not know what the program is, but the Senate has

just passed the discharge pay bill for the men in the armed forces. It is my hope that we may take that bill up by unanimous consent when it is messaged here and put it on passage today. I want to serve notice now that I am going to oppose any adjournment over the holidays until that measure is disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia has made a simple request; that is that when the business before the House is concluded and while we are waiting on other important matters that may come from the Senate, the Chair be privileged to declare a recess. The Chair does not think that should be controversial. If it is, let somebody object.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the business of the day and such special orders as may be on the Speaker's desk, I may be privileged to address the House for 15 minutes on a report from the Subcommittee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an excerpt from the magazine Flying, and a brief letter; also, to extend my remarks and to include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RATIONING OF PORK AND PORK PRODUCTS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the rationing of pork should be discontinued for at least 2 weeks. That would relieve the congestion in the markets and in the storage houses.

I have received a telegram from a meat-processing concern in my district, which I want to read:

Great hog supply and consumer inability to purchase because of limited points is causing serious emergency. Cold-storage space unavailable. O. P. A. and W. F. A. deny relief. We earnestly urge your influence to obtain 10-day emergency point-free period on fresh pork.

Action should be taken by the O. P. A. to relieve the situation. To do otherwise is unfair to farmers, packers, processors, and the consumers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include two editorials from the Bay City Times, of Bay City, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the other special orders today I may be permitted to speak for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and to include certain extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

LET US PROVIDE DECENT BURIAL FOR OUR SOLDIER DEAD

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to bills introduced by Senator McNARY and myself the Congress enacted Public Law 388, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, which was approved by the President December 29, 1941, and which reads as follows:

S. 793

An act to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to establish and maintain, in accordance with the provisions of law governing national cemeteries, a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg. The Secretary of War is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise such suitable lands as are in his judgment necessary for the establishment and maintenance of such cemetery.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this act.
Approved, December 29, 1941.

The Secretary of War is authorized, under the terms of this law, to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise such suitable lands as are in his judgment necessary for the establishment and maintenance of such a cemetery. At the present time there is great need for such a cemetery. Existing facilities are wholly inadequate to care for the burial of veterans in the Northwest area. The Federal Government had a plot set aside in the Lincoln Memorial Cemetery in Portland for the burial of deceased veterans, but this plot is fully occupied. The State of Oregon purchased adjoining land a few years ago to provide facilities for veterans' burial which was intended for a limited time only, which is now entirely inadequate. Funds are not sufficient to maintain this plot adequately and to provide for the increasing number of burials of veterans made necessary by deaths in this locality, including many from World War No. 2.

The nearest veterans' cemetery is south of San Francisco, a thousand or

fifteen hundred miles distant from the various portions of the territory which will be served by a veterans' cemetery in Portland. This cemetery would give burial facilities for veterans from the State of Oregon and adjoining territory in which there are no facilities for burials in a national cemetery, in which there are at the present time approximately 155,000 veterans of the various wars, as shown by the following tabulation:

There are in the State of Oregon 41,219 World War veterans, 41 Civil War veterans, 47 Indian war veterans, 2,673 Spanish-American War veterans, and 393 peacetime veterans. In the State of Washington there are 64,999 World War veterans, 46 Civil War veterans, 65 Indian War veterans, 4,169 Spanish-American War veterans, and 747 peacetime veterans. Idaho has 15,457 World War veterans, 11 Civil War veterans, 19 Indian war veterans, 672 Spanish-American War veterans, and 103 peacetime veterans. Montana has 20,610 World War veterans, 5 Civil War veterans, 75 Indian war veterans, 892 Spanish-American War veterans, and 148 peacetime veterans. The figures for Alaska are a total of 2,500. In the above States there are a total of 142,285 World War veterans, 103 Civil War veterans, 206 Indian war veterans, 8,406 Spanish-American War veterans, and 1,396 peacetime veterans. The total number of veterans in the above territory is 154,896.

The average age of the World War veterans is 48; Spanish-American War veterans, 69; Civil War, 96; Indian war, 81. It is estimated that a total of 103 World War veterans die each day; Spanish-American War veterans at the rate of 24 a day; Civil War, 3 a day; and Indian war, 1 a day. These figures are the 1940 rate. There are approximately 4,000,000 World War veterans surviving, 159,230 Spanish-American War veterans, 2,381 Civil War veterans, and 2,216 Indian war veterans. In applying the death rate proportionately to the number of World War, Spanish, Indian, and Civil War veterans residing in the Northwest, there are approximately 4% deaths per day. This figure does not take into consideration the peacetime veterans or officers and enlisted men of the Army and Navy, since mortality figures covering these groups are not available.

Most of the veterans in the above-mentioned territory would only have to be transported within a radius of 400 to 500 miles to this cemetery authorized under Public Law 388.

Another thing that should be taken into consideration is the fact that in the last year or so there have been established numerous Army and Navy camps and other military establishments in the Northwest. There are pursuit bases established at the following locations in the Northwest: Portland Columbia Airport; McChord Field at Tacoma, Pendleton, Spokane; a large munitions dump at Hermiston; Army camps at Camp Adair, Medford, Fort Stevens, Camp Clatsop, Camp Murray, Camp Lewis; Navy stations at Tongue

Point at the mouth of the Columbia River; and a large Navy and Coast Guard personnel located in the Puget Sound area. The approximate number of Army and Navy personnel in these various camps would exceed 100,000 men who would be entitled to burial in a national cemetery in case of death.

We also have in this Northwest area four veterans' hospitals, besides the one at Portland—one at Walla Walla, 248 miles from Portland; Boise, Idaho, 479 miles from Portland; Roseburg, Oreg., 196 miles from Portland; and a new Army hospital located at Vancouver, Wash., 8 miles from Portland.

Under the increased military activities in the Northwest incident to the present program of national defense, Portland is the principal center of extensive military activity. The number of the Army and Navy personnel in active service in the various encampments in the Northwest are considerable in excess of 100,000 men and these numbers are being steadily increased—exact number prohibited by censorship. As I have stated, there are five veterans' hospitals in the radius of Portland as the center. Most of these men reside in the Northwest in the area which will be served by a national cemetery. It is but natural, of course, that there will be a number of deaths in addition to those taking place in normal times and after the intensified defense program ends. These men who have taken part in it and have been enrolled in the service will be eligible for burial in the veterans' cemetery as death may overtake them in the future.

A large number of deaths have occurred in the United States as casualties from the present war and burial facilities are required in national cemeteries in the vicinity of the residences or place of death of the veterans. After the war the remains of many deceased veterans will be returned from overseas. The friends and relatives of these heroes who have paid the supreme sacrifice for their country will want them to lie in their last resting place in the soil of their homes which they died to preserve. Their remains should not be taken to some distant national cemetery for burial.

These increased demands have overburdened the already inadequate burial facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I am advised that there is a tract contiguous to the existing plot being used by the Federal Government for the veterans' cemetery which is available at a nominal price through the activities of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, and the Portland Chamber of Commerce, working through their council for national defense.

This land has been examined by the War Department and found to be of a type and character to render it especially well adapted for use as a national cemetery.

The Board of Control of the State of Oregon has tendered to the War Department without charge the present State veterans' cemetery which adjoins the plot now being used for veterans by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, since the passage of this law (Pub. Law 388) the veterans organizations of the Northwest and public and civic groups, realizing the great need for this cemetery, have been urging the construction of the cemetery pursuant to the mandate of this law. I have on many occasions presented the urgency of the cause to the Congress, the President, the War Department, the Budget Bureau without avail. I include in these remarks some of the correspondence on the subject in which I have urged action, and the letters in reply. They are as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 3, 1942.
Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ANGELL: I am writing to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of June 27, 1942, to the President, in the interest of an appropriation for the establishment of the national cemetery authorized by Public Law 388—Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 29, 1941.

At the time the President approved S. 793, he wrote a letter to the Secretary of War in which he said: " * * * I am writing to indicate to you my view that under present conditions funds for land purchases should be limited to urgent defense needs, and that, in view of the burial space that is still available in existing national cemeteries, I would not expect that there would be a need for sending forward at any early date any estimate of appropriation under the authorization provided by this enactment."

I am confident that the President is of this view still, and that he would not favor an appropriation for the establishment, at this time, of this national cemetery.

Sincerely yours,
MARVIN H. MCINTYRE,
Secretary to the President.

PORTLAND, OREG., October 13, 1942.
The President,
The White House, Washington, D. C.:

Have just inspected burial facilities for veterans here in my district and conferred with veterans' organizations, and they are urging initiation of action for development of veterans' national cemetery project under Public Law 388, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved by you December 29, 1941. Burial facilities for veterans exhausted and State of Oregon will need to the Government the cemetery facilities owned and developed by it for veterans to be used in connection with adjoining lands to be purchased by Government for site of national cemetery recently inspected by War Department. We all earnestly beseech your cooperation in initiating the project, which will require only small appropriation and not interfere with war activities, but will furnish burial facilities for deceased veterans in this area who desire to rest in their native land. Nearest veterans' cemetery now San Francisco or Montana.

HOMER D. ANGELL,
Member of Congress.

OCTOBER 21, 1943.
Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am taking the liberty of calling to your attention again the urgent matter of securing funds for the establishment of a national cemetery pursuant to Public Law 388, Seventy-seventh Congress, copy of which I enclose. I wrote you on May 29 with respect to this matter and on the same date addressed a similar letter to the Secretary of War, who, under date of April 7 advised me that at that time

there had been no change in the situation relative to the establishment of the cemetery pursuant to your decision at the time you signed Public 388, that funds for land purchases should be limited to urgent war needs.

My purpose in writing at this time is to ask whether the situation now does not require a change in the above policy. As you know, there are no burial facilities left in the Portland area for veterans, and there are a number of cases arising out of the present war, as well as many from veterans of former wars, whose ages are such that death is occurring much more rapidly among them. It will take, of course, some little time to construct the cemetery, and all the veterans' organizations of the northwest area who are now without any burial facilities are greatly concerned and aroused over the failure to secure funds with which to proceed with the construction of the cemetery under the law passed by the Congress.

I am sure that you are as anxious as we on the Hill are to provide adequately for those who are fighting for us and who in many instances are giving their lives for our country. We realize that provision must be made that their remains may rest in their homeland upon their decease. The nearest national veterans' cemetery is now some eight hundred to a thousand miles away, which makes it impossible for providing burial facilities for veterans in their homeland.

It would seem now that the providing of burial facilities for veterans not only of former wars but of the present war is an urgent war need, and therefore suitable allocation of funds for the construction of the cemetery at this time would come well within your limitation at the time you signed the bill. I know the people of the whole northwest area, as well as the thousands of veterans there, will appreciate your O. K. on an appropriation sufficient to start construction of the cemetery.

The War Department has already made an examination of the site, and it is my understanding has reported favorably upon it, and the State has agreed to surrender the lands it has in the existing facilities which were provided for veterans, so that there is nothing to be done except make provision for funds to carry out the mandate of Public Law 388, Seventy-seventh Congress.

Respectfully yours,
HOMER D. ANGELL,
Member of Congress.

OCTOBER 26, 1943.
Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: The Secretary of War has asked me to acknowledge your letter of October 21 in further regard to the appropriation of funds for the acquisition of land for the establishment of a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg., and to advise you that he has directed that your comments be taken under consideration and a report rendered to him at the earliest practicable date.

When this report is available, Mr. Stimson will doubtless reply in further detail to you. Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MARTYN,
Administrative Assistant.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 20, 1943.
Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: This is in further reply to your letter of October 21 concerning the appropriation of funds for the acquisition of land for the establishment of a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg.

The matter of establishing a national cemetery in Portland, Oreg., together with identical requests from different parts of the country and similar proposals contained in several bills now pending before Congress has been made the occasion of a special study of the entire problem as now presented to the War Department. As a result, it has been determined that no American dead beyond the continental limits of the United States will be returned before the cessation of hostilities, that at the end of the war the decision of the nearest of kin of deceased soldiers will be determined and definite plans then made, and accordingly that no expansion of national cemeteries of the United States will be planned at this time.

You realize, I am sure, that many considerations incapable of definite evaluation at this time must be known before any program for the proper interment of our war dead can be intelligently established. To mention a few, we cannot predict how many casualties will occur on the widely distributed battle fronts of war; we cannot predict what the wishes of the nearest of kin will be at the time when shipping space becomes available for this purpose, and we cannot know before the cessation of hostilities what the desires of the nearest of kin will be concerning interment of our war dead in private rather than national cemeteries. At present a sufficient number of burial sites is available in this country to provide for any presently apparent or expected number of war dead.

In view of these indeterminate factors, and also in view of the Presidential directive that funds for land purchases be limited to urgent war needs, a directive issued by the President at the time he signed the bill authorizing the establishment of a national cemetery at Portland, the War Department does not contemplate at present to submit an estimate for funds in connection with the provisions of Public Law 388.

Sincerely yours,
HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.
NOVEMBER 11, 1943.

Hon. HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Executive Office of the President,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: I have for acknowledgment your letter of November 10 in reply to my letter of October 21 addressed to the President urging approval of a sufficient appropriation for the establishment of a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg., in pursuance of Public Law 388 of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

I note from your letter that it is expected that a plan will be developed at an early date based on the requirements for such cemeteries throughout the Nation, and in view of this fact it is believed that action on any particular cemetery site should be held in abeyance until tentative plans are completed.

I am in full sympathy with this comprehensive study and the inauguration of a plan for the construction of cemeteries in all States of the Nation where their need is shown. However, I do not feel that this at all justifies refusal to proceed with the construction of the cemetery pursuant to Public Law 388, which has been passed by the Congress and approved by the President. The need for this cemetery is so urgent that no delay is justified. All of the information which any study or investigation will disclose is already in the possession of the War Department as well as the Military Committees of the Congress, which passed upon the legislation, and the merits of the plan were sufficient to secure the passage of the law by both Houses of the Congress and approval by the President.

As you know, there are no burial facilities now available for veterans in the whole

Northwest territory, the nearest cemeteries being south of San Francisco and in Montana, or from 1,000 to 1,500 miles from the various places in the Northwest which would be served by a cemetery constructed under the provisions of Public Law 388. Increased numbers of deaths of servicemen in the Northwest are taking place from day to day in World War No. 2, which add to the large number of veterans of former wars who are passing away in increased numbers by reason of advancing age, making it imperative that immediate steps be taken for the construction of this cemetery.

As I have said before in urging approval of an appropriation for the cemetery, it would seem to be as much a legitimate war activity to provide decent burial places in the homeland of men who gave their lives in the war as it is to provide them with food, protection, and ammunition during life.

I do certainly hope that those in charge of the President's program will yield to the demands of the thousands of veterans in the Northwest and approve an appropriation now for beginning construction of this cemetery.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

HOMER D. ANGELL,
Member of Congress.

THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE

OF THE PRESIDENT,

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,

Washington, D. C., December 17, 1943.

The Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ANGELL: I have received your letter of November 11, 1943, in which you emphasize the immediate need of establishing a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg. Accordingly, I have had the question reexplored with the War Department.

I am advised that under existing law the responsibility of acquiring land for national cemeteries, when and where needed, rests with the Secretary of War. It is interpreted, therefore, that Public Law 388 of the Seventy-seventh Congress did not add to the authority of the Secretary of War but rather gave expression of the will of Congress that a national cemetery should be established near Portland when the Secretary determines that such a cemetery is needed.

The statistics available to the War Department indicate that, exclusive of persons who will become entitled to burial in national cemeteries as a result of the present war, the cemeterial space now owned by the Government at national cemeteries would not be adequate to provide burial for all who are entitled to it. It is also true, however, that only a relatively small percentage of those who are legally entitled to burial in national cemeteries do so request, and the deaths of those requesting such burial are expected to be spread over a considerable span of years. Consequently, it is not essential to provide space at this time for all who are now entitled to burial.

The number of persons who will be entitled to burial in national cemeteries will be greatly increased as a result of the current conflict. The War Department is of the opinion that in planning cemeterial expansion it must give due consideration to this new load involved and to the question of reinterment of those who are today being buried overseas. In view of the importance of the problem, the War Department considers it essential that its current study be completed before new cemeteries are established.

The War Department reports that it has been determined that no American troops dying beyond the continental limits of the United States will be returned before the

cessation of hostilities, and that there are at present a sufficient number of burial sites to provide for the reasonably expected current need.

You may be assured that your views on the subject will be kept in mind for consideration in connection with any action in this field which the Bureau of the Budget may be called upon to take. Proposals for the establishment of new national cemeteries would, of course, originate with the War Department.

Very truly yours,

WAYNE COY,
Acting Director.

Mr. Speaker, decent burial of our deceased citizens, who gave their lives for their country, in a national cemetery in the land of their fathers is a sacred obligation resting upon our Government. Burial of our countrymen who give their lives in war is a war obligation as much as the furnishing them with powder and guns. I cannot subscribe to the doctrine that the burial of our heroic dead whose bodies are here in America can wait until the war is over. Let us act now and provide dead veterans with decent burial.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I plead with you before we adjourn for the Christmas holidays that we all urge upon the President and the Secretary of War and the Director of the Budget that they make immediate provisions to abide by the will of this Congress and construct the veterans' national cemetery as provided in the law we passed unanimously. If we can spend billions of American hard-earned tax dollars in South America and overseas to aid others, we can provide enough money to bury our own dead soldiers in their homeland.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, for over a year we have heard from the Well of this House the absurd and senseless regulations of big things by the O. P. A. I want to speak of two of the smallest things that are absolutely indefensible, and I challenge any Member to stand up and defend either one of the regulations. A serviceman on furlough or on leave has only 5 gallons of gas for his furlough or his leave. That is perfectly indefensible.

The other thing is, there is no legal gas for anyone to attend funerals. You cannot go 50 miles even to attend your own mother's funeral, under the regulations of O. P. A.

I do this with the hope that the O. P. A. will change these fool regulations on these two little things at least.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix an editorial from the Washington News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WOODROW WILSON'S LAST WARNING

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include therewith the last message from Woodrow Wilson and his last warning to the American people.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

[Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two different subjects, in one to include a letter to my constituents; in another to include a release from a disabled American veteran.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SOLDIERS' VOTING BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] in his attack on southern Democrats and the Southern States generally, accused me of leading the Republicans. I do not know whether any Republicans are following my leadership or not, but I do know the Democrats are not following the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

He can pose here as the official leader of the so-called American Labor Party, which seems to have become one wing of the Communist Party, but he does not represent any real Democrats.

A few days ago there was an article in the newspaper PM, the uptown edition of the Communist Daily Worker, attacking me and accusing me of jumping on the Jews because I inserted in the RECORD some names which it said were Jewish. That article was signed "I. F. Stone," whose real name is not I. F. Stone at all, it is Isidor Feinstein.

I merely inserted in the RECORD the names of people who had written me from New York opposing the Eastland-Rankin soldiers' voting bill. I did not know whether they were Jews or Gentiles.

A few days ago a gang of them came down here and paraded up and down the corridors of the House Office Building lobbying against what they call the "Rankin bill." If I am any judge, they were Communists, pure and simple—probably more simple than pure.

When they came to my office, one of them looked up and saw my name on the door and said, "Gosh, we don't want to go in there." That was one thing I agreed with them on. They looked like foreigners to me. I never saw such a wilderness of noses in my life.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] says that the people whose names I inserted in the RECORD are "wives of men in our armed forces." Now let us see about that.

One of the names I inserted on December 7 was Julius Reisman. I do not suppose he is the wife of a serviceman.

The next one was Mr. William Liebowitz. I wonder whose wife the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] thinks Mr. Liebowitz is?

Another was Miss Pearl Preiss. If she is the wife of a serviceman, she should take his name.

Another was Hirsch Zibbman. I wonder whose wife he is?

Now of the names inserted on December 10, the first one was B. Marcein, the next one E. S. Blamc, the next H. M. Reuben, the next Aaron L. Rochman, and the next one J. M. Grohol. I wonder if the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] will contend that these are wives of men in the armed forces.

I have a batch which I received this morning. One is from Abraham Gomerontz, another is Robert Strassburg. I do not suppose that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] will contend that these are the names of wives of men in our armed forces.

In addition, I have received letters and postal cards from large numbers of individuals since I made the last insertion. Some of those letters were so filthy and abusive that I had them destroyed rather than leave them in my files. Some were unsigned, and on others the signatures were so poorly written that I could not make out what the names were. I had the others tabulated as they came. Here they are. I hope you will pay strict attention and go over them carefully, and see if you think they are all wives of men in our armed forces.

B. Ragell, Brooklyn; Anita S. Rosen, Far Rockaway, N. Y.; Mary E. Billingsley, Mrs. Mary Schroeder, Brooklyn; Mrs. Lloyd Motz, W. G. Kearney, New York City; Mrs. S. Turk, Brooklyn; Esther Lipschultz, Jersey City, N. J.; Irwin Isham, Flushing, N. Y.; June Liss, Mrs. Lucille Bader, Martha King, Beverley Kistenberg, Mrs. John A. Welton, Elaine Shaffer, Harill Roberts, Brooklyn; M. W. Cohn, New York City; Mrs. Frances Miller, Lewiston, Maine; Jay Sammy, New York City; Evelyn Schnitzer, South Norwalk, Conn.; R. Schwartzberger, Mrs. Wild, Brooklyn; Mr. and Mrs. D. B. Tullen, Hartford, Conn.; Mrs. Lion A. Gove, New York City; Robert Forsberg, Wooster, Ohio; Dixie Louise Fiske, Washington, D. C.; Morton Lownes, Philadelphia, Pa.; Ella Grace Webb, New York City; Anne Koleyon, Lakewood, N. J.; Mrs. Nathan, Brooklyn; Miss E. Gershon, New York City; S. Weintraub, P. Seldon, Lillian Hauptman, Brooklyn; H. Jacobs, Flushing, N. Y.; Gerry Kinne, Baltimore, Md.; G. Marchisio, New York City; Laurin G. Fischer, Brooklyn; C. Dwoskin, Sheephead Bay, N. Y.; Evelyn F. Parkes, Viggo Westergaard, New York City; Sylvia L. Lyon, Mount Vernon, N. Y.; Mrs. Nellie Lagal, New York City; Helen Brown, Mount Vernon, N. Y.; Winifred L. Chappell, New York City; William and Minnie Dalton, Passaic, N. J.; Jerry Stern, New York City; Morris Shom, Passaic, N. J.; Lorna R. F. Birtwell, New York City; Mrs. A. Bisberg, Brookline, Mass.; Ruthe Pessin, Sylvia Fuchs, Mrs. Segal, New York City; Walter M. Stone, Waltham, Mass.; Irving Smith, Brooklyn; Uric Cole, Joan Solomon, New York City; Mina Ohringer, Brooklyn; Mabel W. Smith, Philadelphia, Pa.; M. A. Werner, New York City; Alice G. Meyer, Ann Nustgarten, Bronx; Miriam A. Ness, Lillian Hoffman, New York City; Max R. Kahn, Brooklyn; L. M. Tickerman, New London, Conn.; M. Gelford, Brook-

lyn; Mrs. Milton Schlachman, New York City; Sally Fondel, Bronx; Henry Payne, Saugatuck, Conn.; Bertha Lurie, Bronx; Fredric S. Kless, Swarthmore, Pa.; Helen Relkin, New York City; Mrs. Roine Harris, Brooklyn; Miss Barbara Haber, Bronx; Ben Rabinowitz, Brooklyn; Harry Brown, camp in Georgia; Mrs. Frances Cohen, Vivian Cohen, Henry E. Cohen, Brooklyn; Valerie Hickerson, New York City; Mrs. Albert F. Kroll, Pittsburgh; Ellen Thomas, Brooklyn; Mrs. Earl Collins, C. M. Wisegarver, Mrs. C. R. Foy, Charles R. Foy, Johnstown, Pa.; Rae Sturm, Brooklyn; Augusta Wallace, New York City; Mildred Brofman, Brooklyn; Maud Slye, Chicago; Mr. and Mrs. Philip Bernstein, Forest Hills, N. Y.; Frances Simon, Philadelphia, Pa.; Evelyn Kaplan, Brooklyn; Maria De Blasio, New York City; Edith Zeitler, Frances E. Klein, Bronx; Emma Begun, Rebecca Mechnikoff, Edith Bergman, Rose Gropman, Eugene B. Foley, Brooklyn; Yetta Messing, New York City; Drane Selberling, Sylvia Berger, Ruth L. Drossin, Selma Diamond, Marie Latilla, Gertrude Valitsky, Mary Berger, Doris L. Willis, Samuel Lepine, Estelle Marcus, Marion E. Kasner, Brooklyn; Sylvia F. Wolf, New York City; Florence R. Kaufman, Brooklyn; Anna D'Auella, Mary A. Golub, New York City; Muriel Smith, Paul F. Stevens, Theodore Fagin, George E. Bollar, Bernard Shor, J. S. Scheiner, G. S. Schaeffer, George Bell, John Johnson, Fred James, Pearl Sadowski, Elizabeth Hansen, Ernest J. Pepper, Charles W. Davis, Mary Glickert, Harold Seigel, John A. Perry, Nancy Cuttittio, Helen Miller, Gertrude Neibel, Kathleen Emery, Ottillie Affel, Rose M. Beal, Martha Brady, Mary Biscardi, Florence Schilder, M. Baines, Barbara Morris, Helen Weinstein, Ida Herthelg, Frances Fila, R. Kellman, J. Carro, A. Dumruff, E. Soppe, E. Hock, J. Finch, J. Distefano, E. Delosh, J. Sanfilippo, F. Baque, J. Fay, W. Fusco, F. Foeppel, W. Slaughter, P. Isaacs, R. Bothwick, G. Finny, B. Kennedy, B. Rothenberg, A. Ferro, A. Maffie, R. Andreas, T. McCormick, C. Leone, D. Arbuse, J. Barsuaskas, Alec Donner, Isabel Fantel, Sarah Lar, Ann Green, Helen Gardstein, Sarah Sparago, May Farber, Ada Jaffe, Sam Eppy, Allen Friedlich, Sylvia Lichtman, Doree Abramson, Sophie Sobel, Francis Berkwitz, Brooklyn; Rowe Wright, Katonah, N. Y.; A. R. Garrett, New York City; Elizabeth H. Cagle, Baltimore, Md.; Colleen P. Roth, Nancy Starbuck, Richmond, Va.; Thelma Stein, Beatrice W. Chinnock, Mrs. B. T. Chusid, New York City; Donald T. Braider, New Brunswick, N. J.; Barbara Haber, Bronx; Ada M. Clarke, Norwich, Conn.; Lorraine Carter, New York City; Eva Michelson, Freida Hessel, Charlotte Lee, Mrs. L. Buyum, Brooklyn; Grace N. Thompson, Eatontown, N. J.; Helen Thaler, Brooklyn; H. M. Winston, New York City; Mrs. H. Bull, Mildred Block, Long Beach, N. Y.; Florence Horowitz, New York City; A. Mass, Brooklyn; Mary Arnone, Rockaway, N. Y.; Erich P. Fritscl, Eatontown, N. J.; Yetta Salewitz, Bayonne, N. J.; Mrs. H. Granet, Brooklyn; Mrs. M. Steinberg, Samuel Levine, New York City; Dora M. Herwitz, Brooklyn; Katherine Steiglitz, New York City; Anna K. Rogers, Brooklyn; Mrs. R. J. Doyle, Mrs. Jay Williams, Ernest J. Fantasia, Cella Polimany, New York City; G. J. Grohol, Scarsdale, N. Y.; Janet Laken, New York City; Mrs. M. Thompson, Baltimore, Md.; Jerome Ackerman, Yonkers, N. Y.; John L. Debes, Syracuse, N. Y.; Olga G. Collinson, Cambridge, Mass.; Ephraim F. Hubert, Brooklyn; Hattie M. Herrick, East Syracuse, N. Y.; Rita Rosenthal, New York City; I. Lerner, Henry King, Brooklyn; Nancy Thompson, West Palm Beach, Fla.; Mrs. Hiram Hays, Pelham Manor, N. Y.; Julius Birnbaum, Brooklyn; J. E. Pikell, Baltimore, Md.; Edward Venkler, New York City; Mr. and Mrs. F. A. Warren, Hempstead, N. Y.; B. Birnbaum, C. Stern, I. Lerner, Brooklyn; Mary Miller, Benton Harbor, Mich.; S. N. Urman, Forest Hills, N. Y.; Kay Brown, New

York City; Dorothy J. Sevush, Virginia Smith, Long Branch, N. J.; Theodore N. Shavit, Estelle Farbstein, H. Weston, New York City; Rev. Jas. H. Screven, Newark, N. J.; Anna Lo Presti, Seymour, Conn.; Alice Smith, New York City; Charlotte Miller, Brooklyn; M. Cornog, Media, Pa.; Rupert J. Graham, Saugatuck, Conn.; Naomi Rodman, Betty Rodman, New York City; Dorothy C. Busch, Catherine Thompson, Bordentown, N. J.; Mrs. J. Cunningham, Philadelphia, Pa.; Florence R. Connolly, Kathryn M. Sulzberger, Isabel Lipscomb, New York City; Sylvia P. Freedland, Philadelphia, Pa.; Muriel P. Hallpern, Forest Hills, N. Y.; Helen M. Zippert, New York City; Mrs. M. L. Villano, New Haven, Conn.; Pearl Waxman, Washington, D. C.; Margaret Epstein, Elizabeth Swift, Cambridge, Mass.; Rosalie Gilbert, Brooklyn; Noah Lichtenberg, Hoboken, N. J.; R. Schlein, Julius Polinger, Mrs. T. Hamilton, New York City; Veronica A. O'Neil, Aurora, Ill.; Beth M. Strunk, New York City; Solomon Landman, Kew Gardens, N. Y.; Mrs. L. O'Connor, New York City; A. Goeringer, W. Goeringer, Haskell, N. J.; George Blass, New York City; E. S. Tamblyn, Rutherford, N. J.; Elsie Cohen, Elizabeth, N. J.; Virginia Scholz, Boonton, N. J.; Mrs. Charles Haywood, New York City; Mrs. S. W. Shapiro, Brooklyn; Rebecca T. Morris, New York City; Jane P. Paterson, Washington, D. C.; Harriet Borten, Philadelphia, Pa.; Sylvia B. Altman, A. Kashtenbaum, Miss Campbell, Brooklyn; Harold Tamain, G. Bullock, Charlie Whitfield, T. J. Phelan, Stanley Dombroff, Baltimore, Md.; Susan R. Kaufman, West Chester, Pa.; Louis Kustas, Manteo, N. C.; Muriel I. Symington, Brooklyn; D. Roth, Yonkers; Mrs. A. Citron, New York City; Minnie B. Stern, Brooklyn; Mrs. F. Sullivan, Ruth Veletzkin, New York City; J. Kelsler, Philadelphia, Pa.; William Reine, Brooklyn; J. S. Brown, R. Levering, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. M. Marashinsky, Mt. Dale, N. Y.; Ethel Miller, New York City; Mr. and Mrs. R. W. Barstow, Jr., Pauling, N. Y.; Anne E. Cohen, Shirley Prussin, New York City; Harriet Silver, Mrs. M. Frank, Robert Halpern, Edna Halpern, Brooklyn; Pauline Mazur, St. Paul; Estelle Grusky, Bronx; Ida Sherman, Brooklyn; Ellen O'Connor, New York City; A. R. Romer, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. B. Lovinger, Brooklyn; Mrs. Martin L. Morris, Ella Grace Webb, New York City; Sylvia M. Campbell, Montclair, N. J.; Elizabeth Schneider, New York City; Donald Miles, Dunmore, Pa.; Kay Mott, Philadelphia, Pa.; Miss Feldman, Woodside, N. Y.; Gussie Hoffman, Faye Sternberg, Mrs. Robert Rosenfeld, Bernard Adelburg, Louis Brotkin, Bernard M. Klein, Brooklyn; Miriam Mandelbaum, New York City; Gloria Heitman, Bronx; Tillie Klein, Rae Teret, Brooklyn; Jane McGlove, New York City; Mr. and Mrs. Arnold Jacoby, Harold Jacoby, Mr. and Mrs. Jack Ruby, H. Margulis, Brooklyn; C. Pat Quinn, Mort Furay, Detroit; Pauline Plaks, Brooklyn; Gertrude Burke Jacobs, Oceanside, N. Y.; George F. Connolly, Paterson, N. J.; Harriet Kremer, New Brunswick, N. J.; Mrs. J. Boris, Jamaica, N. Y.; Mrs. Harriet Bier, Long Island City, N. Y.; Sol Atter, E. H. McFadden, U. M. Falk, New York City; J. I. Braver, Brooklyn; J. R. Thomas, New York City; Margaret Solar, Mrs. Luly Lewis, A. Goldman, Sidney Wendroff, Brooklyn; E. Lewanski, New York City; Sam Bloom, Brooklyn; Ursula Reinhardt, New York City; Allan Mullgraw, Spring Valley, N. Y.; Gerald Beckman, New York City; Lean J. Lawson, Mrs. L. Snider, Brooklyn; Dr. and Mrs. Richard A. Freedman, New York City; Freddie Freidman, Boston; Rudolf Ekstein, George C. Murphy, Ray O'Connor, Brooklyn; Frank S. Regan, Ridgefield, N. J.; Rhoda Woolf, New York City; Mary Ward Parker, Fairmont, W. Va.; P. A. Sutherland, Hyde Park, Mass.; J. Robert Garrapit, Flushing, N. Y.; B. Murphy, L. O'Connor, F. Finnegan, Bronx; Mrs. A. Blumin, New Haven, Conn.; Beatrice Nelson, Mollie Gelenter, Marie L. Colt, New York City; Lillian Konigsberg,

Bronx; Nellie H. Rosalsky, Sylvia Bier, Brooklyn; George Lackides, Bronx; Lucille B. Levy, New York City; Sally Rosen, Lawrence, N. Y.; Alma Wade, Kate Lublich, New York City; Claire Libner, Brooklyn; Robert C. Waddell, New York City; Pvt. (1st cl.) Jules Glenn, Long Island City; Elaine M. Rosenweig, Gertrude Ettenson, New York City; Ethel J. Mason, Brooklyn; Fuld Neighborhood House, Newark, N. J.; Mina Schneider, Mina Zinet, Gladys Rivlin, Clara S. Straus, J. A. Burrell, Raymond Weaver, New York City; Frida Rosenbusch, Brooklyn; Lee H. Bell, Lake Mahopac, N. Y.; Eleanor Emerson, S. Hagen, New York City; Leon Solis-Cohen, Philadelphia, Pa.; Ed Murphy, Utica, N. Y.; Fredda A. Groner, Bronx; Alma T. Colson, Westfield, N. J.; Mrs. George Abelloff, Jack Toppel, Brooklyn; William Bandes, Nescopeck, Pa.; Irwin Ferris, Bronx; Elizabeth Carney, Rose L. Waters, Brooklyn; Horace Braham, New York City; M. V. Brett, Detroit; Mrs. William Taylor, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. Matthew Uchansky, Bronx; Rosalind Cherry, Rosalyn Papkin, New York City; Jack Badash, Jr., Brooklyn; James T. Smallway, Utica, N. Y.; William C. Kernan, New York City; Ernest Malter, Chicago; Sada Zimmerman, Bronx; Elizabeth Mannes, New York City; Belle Cohen, Brooklyn; Edith Greenberg, Gertrude Metz, New York City; Riva Shapkautz, Mae Greenburg, Rita Harris, Brooklyn; Augusta Levinson, Mina Suser, Bronx; Oscar Marks, New York City; Susan F. Ronson, Brooklyn; Louis Villano, Fort McKinley, Maine; Samson Winkoff, New York City; Celia Solomon, Washington, D. C.; Grace I. Lewis, New York City; Jules Rubin, Philadelphia, Pa.; Ida Sach, Brooklyn; Mrs. P. Sokolow, New York City; Betty Leiberman, Bronx; Lewis H. Davis, Seymour, Conn.; Alice R. Hart, Wayne, Pa.; Roberta S. Leibovitz, Eleanor Weaver, Arlington, Va.; Beatrice Olinger, New York City; Aurora Acanfora, Newark, N. J.; Rachel Reese Sady, Raymond Ross, George J. Leech, Mrs. M. G. Warth, New York City; Irvin Lambert, Bronx; Mary C. Scheele, New York City; Dr. and Mrs. J. Rubin, Morristown, N. J.; Janet Manning, Newark, N. J.; M. H. Rubenstein, New York City; Emma Gelders Sterne, Cambridge, Mass.; Lonnie Rasin, Norwich, Conn.; Sarah Seltzer, Harriet Taglicht, New York City; Elizabeth Neabitt, St. Louis; Esther G. Chernofsky, Jersey City, N. J.; Gertrude Housen, Leonard Gerstein, New York City; Mrs. Jerome Paul Friedman, Brooklyn; Margaret R. Tansley, South Orange, N. J.; Beverly Hancock, Lincoln, Nebr.; Lawrence H. Leder, Bronx; Howard R. Coan, Lawrenceville, N. J.; Leroy Dixon, New York City; Hilda Peirez, Jackson Heights, N. Y.; Mrs. L. Ham Kaplan, Chicago; Paul Covais, Maria Pacheco, New York City; Mary K. Schiller, Brooklyn; Ada M. Clarke, Norwich, Conn.; Mrs. H. Shapiro, I. Diverman, Brooklyn; Ruth Fields, Bronx; Mrs. M. Sickler, Brooklyn; Pat Sullivan, New York City; Catherine Duba, Great Neck, N. Y.; S. C. Fisher, Mrs. G. Kallivera, New York City; E. Bettelman, Brooklyn; Eugene W. Sutherland, Detroit; Mrs. I. Suslock, Jamaica, N. Y.; Eleanor M. Strachner, Washington, D. C.; M. Krantz, Bronx; Mr. and Mrs. N. H. Moss, Long Branch, N. J.; Beatrice Bell, Philadelphia, Pa.; Florence Ferris, New York City; Edward Kramer, Waltham, Mass.; Lawrence C. Goldsmith, New York City; Jerome Beller, Waltham, Mass.; Sona Holman, Flushing, N. Y.; M. Miller, Jamaica, N. Y.; Rose B. Freeman, Brooklyn; Betty Levin, New York City; Ethel H. Levy, Cincinnati, Ohio; R. Greenberg, New York City; B. V. McGrath, Alice Schreiber, Ridgewood, N. J.; Mr. and Mrs. Charles Faskon, Brooklyn; Mary Kuhl, Bowie, Md.; Thomas Spike, New York City; Martin Gelenter, Bronx; Mrs. Gloria S. Myers, Baltimore, Md.; Theodora M. Harvey, New York City; Miriam Siffert, Brooklyn; Charles Berkowitz, New York City; Harry H. Hoffenberg, Baltimore, Md.; L. J. Carriero, August Sukdorf,

New York City; Charlotte Clyne, Washington, D. C.; Eleanor Wallace, New Haven, Conn.; H. Reingold, New York City; D. F. Bottosfi, Riverhead, N. Y.; Pauline Freeman, New York City; Thea Steele, Hempstead, Long Island, N. Y.; Mr. and Mrs. S. A. Lange, Brooklyn; Robert S. Moore, Syracuse, N. Y.; Dorothy M. Roller, Washington, D. C.; H. Miller, Ethel F. Chalfin, New York City; D. Moss, Detroit; Mr. and Mrs. H. J. Morris, Mrs. John Ackerman, New York City; Gladys K. Diamond, Highstown, N. J.; Florence Blumberg, Bronx; Fred De Feo, David Gordon, G. M. Haley, Beatrice Gordon, Edward De Salisburg, New York City; Nadia Rostova, Brooklyn; Mini F. De Feo, Mrs. N. Rodenwald, Michael Relenbo, Dave Cohen, New York City; Hollis Dean Fairchild, Bay Shore, Long Island, N. Y.; Mrs. R. Steigman, New York City; A. C. McLaughlin, Staten Island, N. Y.; Sadie M. Heinemann, New York City; Sam Dorfman, Presque Isle, Maine; Mrs. Francis Gallagher, Omaha, Nebr.; Arline D. Welch, Terry Watchell, Amelia Jaskulski, New York City; Marvin B. Rodney, Chicago; Joyce Borden, Balokovic Zlatko, B. Elizabeth, Whiting Worcester, Courtney Borden, New York City; Helen H. Walter, Chicago; John R. Tunis, Rowayton, Conn.; Dorothy Krass, New York City; Morton Kulick, Bronx; Helen Hues Parhurst, New York City; Willard Uphaus, New Haven, Conn.; Muriel Melrowitz, Bronx; E. A. Herz, Sidney Mandelsohn, New York City; Adelle Landis, Michael Arond, M. Baket, Brooklyn; Martin Gelenter, Bronx; Morris Turitz, Mike Niederhoffer, Lee Hoeng, L. Grill, New York City; B. A. Drucker, Woodmere, Long Island, N. Y.; S. B. Prenn, Forest Hills, Long Island, N. Y.; Fred Van Eps, New York City; Carl M. Rubin, Brooklyn; James A. Martenhoffer, East Rockaway, N. Y.; Eva Greenberg, Gertrude Yourman, Brooklyn; H. A. Overstreet, New York City; Mrs. John K. Vance, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Dorothy Brewster, New York City; Will H. Pierson, Newark, N. J.; Ken A. Powenstein, New York City; Martha H. Fletcher, Boston, Mass.; Max Kimbrig, Huntington, N. Y.; Myron Galewski, New York City; Sam M. Goldfus, Bradley Beach, N. J.; Mary S. Briody, East Norwalk, Conn.; Mrs. Dale Holt Fatow, New York City; Max Bellak, Browns Mills, N. J.; Moe Green-span, Brooklyn; Mrs. David Moskers, New York City; Mitchell Burnstein, Brooklyn; Shirley La Zar, Bronx; Michele Cimballo, Groton On Hudson, N. Y.; Isador W. Ellman, Brooklyn; Milton T. Malkin, Norwalk, Conn.; Eye Bartram, East Norwalk, Conn.; Elia Favrean, Redding, Conn.; Mildred U. Banks, Norwalk, Conn.; Ethel Willmott, South Norwalk, Conn.; Winifred Malkin, Norwalk, Conn.; Winifred Pennington, Wilton, Conn.; Myrtle England, Loretta Byington, Norwalk, Conn.; Esther Blackman, Stamford, Conn.; Winnie Ferris, South Norwalk, Conn.; Grayce Bredice, Pearl Byington, Norwalk, Conn.; Mae Pape, South Norwalk, Conn.; Agnes B. Colwell, Norwalk, Conn.; Richard Acer, Freeport, N. Y.; Mary D. Hoey, Saranac Lake, N. Y.; Bernard Bernstein, Holyoke, Mass.; Mrs. Daniel Kutzko, Brooklyn; Marian Ward, Mr. and Mrs. J. Lonberger, Joyce M. Kingsley, New York City; Charles W. Ervin, Bronxville, N. Y.; Ruth Phelps Morand, E. W. Kesper, Dorothy Weaver, New York City; Pat Mullison, Tunnie Martin, Detroit; Alfred T. Solomon, New York City; Norman Nash, Brooklyn; Moe Rosenthal, Bayonne, N. J.; Mary Faroin, Belleville, N. J.; Alan Feigenbaum, New York City; Isabel J. England, Pittsfield, Mass.; Elizabeth K. Hold, North Bergen, N. J.; Mrs. Laurence I. McCloud, New York City; Lewis M. Morozty, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Mike Meahh, Lawrence S. Kuble, Cora M. Paradis, New York City; Mrs. Charles W. Greer, Brooklyn; Paul Gardner, New York City; David Rosenberg, Brooklyn; Louis Shulman, Philadelphia; Helen Gottlieb, Alice G. Simensky, Brooklyn; J. B. Horowitz, New York City; Milton R.

Stern, Fort Belvoir, Va.; A. S. Allen, Louis Bernstein, Mrs. B. F. Perry, Mrs. Sol Brandzel, New York City; Reuben Freidman, Providence, R. I.; D. Newman, Brooklyn; Cora Clarke, Norwich, Conn.; Rose Katzman, Brooklyn; Allison Sulloway, Joseph Taill, New York City; Frances Glantz, Philadelphia, Pa.; S. Micch, Brooklyn; Jane Eager, Mary K. Daniel, New York City; Sam Rosen, Laurelton, Long Island, N. Y.; Emanuel Kalish, John Alcorn, New York City; Stephen L. Peake, Boston, Mass.; R. Schwadron, Albany, N. Y.; Lazette Van Houten, New York City; Marion Greene, Mrs. Schwartz, Brooklyn; Jessie Wahrman, Elizabeth Eric, New York City; Jan Ziebach, Herbert R. Lottman, Joan Zilbach, Miss Sylvia Cherner, Brooklyn; S. Jacobs, New York City; S. Lehman, Mr. and Mrs. Norman Engler, Brooklyn; Eleanor Walker, Alex Handis, Rose Ettelman, New York City; Mrs. L. R. Scott, Flushing; Mrs. E. S. Lang, Detroit; E. V. Reidinger, Stamford, Conn.; Mrs. K. G. Streiger, Eleanor Collette, Michael Morrissey, Harry Gladstone, Jess Fish, New York City; Martin Gelenter, Bronx; Muriel Walzer, New York City; Sam Kushner, Chicago; June Gogolick, Brooklyn; Sandra Slayton, Helene Minda, Ester Delsignore, New York City; Mrs. Lawrence T. Fish, Mrs. Howard F. Lillich, Washington, D. C.; R. L. Shoemaker, Los Angeles; Evelyn Knauff, Brooklyn; Yeta Silverman, Mrs. Ruth Silverstein, New York City; Asher Yeude, Far Rockaway; Margaret Farrar, Miss B. Hoffman, J. G. Bendick, New York City; Helen R. Muhlberg, Brooklyn; Sophis Gelber, Washington, D. C.; Max Berger, Boston; Evelyn Klein, Brooklyn; Edith Schulman, New York City; Sima Okum, Mount Vernon, N. Y.; Helene Blanchard, Erich Etten, Isabel C. Chamberlain, New York City; Esther Millon, Providence, R. I.; Jeanette Stern Turner, Mr. and Mrs. Abraham Paul Meyer, New York City; I. De Kaiser, Pittsburgh; Nina Miranda, Brooklyn; H. S. Ehrlich, Helen Rosenberg, New York City; Walter Eiselton, Warrenton, Va.; Mr. and Mrs. E. Mardfin, L. Pillsuk, Brooklyn; Irene Wilson, Cliffside Park, N. J.; Natalie Garvin, Evelyn Horowitz, Michael Satzmann, Brooklyn; Jerome J. Kravatz, Bronx; C. Shalit, Browns Mills, N. J.; Mr. and Mrs. P. L. Krohm, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Howite, P. Cullen, S. Levy, New York City; Marie Moran Rosenfield, Minneapolis; Max B. Greenstein, Brooklyn; William Thalheimer, New York City; Carrie Freidman, Brooklyn; Jean Corwin, New York City; Arthur Eidus, Brooklyn; Mrs. Lea Etta Sitomer, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; John M. Whitmore, Reisterstown, Md.; M. L. Barrett, A. Rosengweiz, Bronx; H. Frank, New York City; F. L. Cohen, Bronx; Fred F. Gold, New York City; Violet Rasmussen, Port Washington, Long Island, N. Y.; Elsie Kratz, Margaret Cohen, Sarah Kay, New York City; Lessie Pfiffer, Sylvia Solomon, Brooklyn; Sara Aiken, Forest Hills, N. Y.; Abe Sharugrudsky, Brooklyn; Melvin Wiene, Bronx; Ruth Mandel, New York City; Gertrude Wolfson, Bronx; Mr. and Mrs. S. Coleman, A. Pessio, M. Cohen, Brooklyn; R. B. Irwin, Elkins Park, Pa.; Norman Kupfenberg, Brooklyn; S. Goodman, New York City; Max Gross, Brooklyn; Martin F. Schnee, Denver, Colo.; Ruth M. Brilliant, Bound Brook, N. J.; Bertha B. Cole, J. M. Cole, New Hope, Pa.; Le Roy S. Rosenbaum, New York City; Pvt. L. Gedaly, Fort Bragg, N. C.; Irene Rosoff and family, New York City; Marjorie N. Bennett, Cambridge, Mass.; Adelaide B. Crandall, Mansfield, Conn.; Robert Cenedella, Mount Vernon, N. Y.; H. L. Miller, Cecilia P. Miller, Nichols, Conn.; Benjamin Fox, Bronx; B. Hoffman, Middle Village, N. Y.; Mrs. Eleanor Scholz, Boonton, N. J.; Harry Gitlin, Bronx; D. Renan, New York City; Alvin Maurer, Brooklyn; R. M. Handshoe, Mrs. Dorothy Nissim, Freda Lane, Bronx; Mrs. E. S. Adelson, Brooklyn; Celia Malishefsky, J. S. Volkert, Bronx; Helen Freidlander, New York City; F. Goldberg, Ruth Kaye, Doris

Kauyar, Bronx; Linda Schuer, Goldens Bridge, N. Y.; Pauline Englander, Jersey City, N. J.; Mrs. Natalie Rothblatt, Elmhurst, Long Island, N. Y.; Lillian Stern, New York City; Mrs. Edith Gluckman, Newark, N. J.; Harry Bretz, Brooklyn; Mr. and Mrs. Arnold Sundgaard, Old Westbury, Long Island, N. Y.; Roslyn Zwicker, Bronx; George Gluck, Gloria Rogoff, New York City; Valerie Lois Gretel, Charles S. Belkin, Brooklyn; Carmen Pena, New York City; Herman Schneider, New York City; Beatrice Winsor, Newark, N. J.; Sidney Hess, Wallington, N. J.; Mrs. Dora Dimen, Brooklyn; Hans Mueller, Mrs. Vivian Yale, Carmen Rodriguez, New York City; Sam Dorfman, Presque Isle, Maine; Lottie Mintzes, Brooklyn; Mr. and Mrs. Edward L. Rich, Derby, Conn.; Arnold Weiner, Ruth Brickner, New York City; Molly Epstein, Brooklyn; David Levidow, Long Island City, N. Y.; Eleanor Redick, Forest Hills, N. Y.; I. L. Weinberg, New York City; Mr. and Mrs. H. L. Glazer, Brooklyn; Ruth C. Foote, New York City; Dorothy Robbins, San Antonio, Tex.; Sylvia Utensky, New York City; Philip Kronish, Brooklyn; Estelle Herstein, Newark, N. J.; Rose Marks, Nina Schneider, Mrs. R. Safer, New York City; Anne C. Lukoff, Miss L. Glasgow, Brooklyn; Milton C. Simon, Ithaca, N. Y.; Mildred Ginsberg, Brooklyn; Isadore M. Zamost, New Brunswick, N. J.; Maurice Kaufman, Bronx; O. M. Resen, Jay M. Cornell, M. H. Lichtenberg, New York City; Mrs. E. Guberman, Baltimore, Md.; William Feinberg, New York City; Mrs. Thomas Wallace, New Haven, Conn.; Nathan Budnetz, Richard Desmond, New York City; Mary J. Brettin, Toledo, Ohio; Lee H. Sharp, Bayside, N. Y.; Herman Kaplan, Clara E. Straus, New York City; Shirley Mauer, Brooklyn; Rose P. Spanier, Forest Hills, N. Y.; Libby Weinberger, Brooklyn; Dolores Ortiz, New York City; Leonard Schwartz, Mrs. Edgar I. Scher, Mrs. Benjamin Mann, Perth Amboy, N. J.; H. Feldman, Brooklyn; Lionel Scheler, New York City; Herman L. Lieberman, Bronx; Joe Follberg, Lamoan, N. Y.; Emanuel Boyers, New York City; M. Rittenenthal, C. Schulman, Brooklyn; Alex Panzer, Louis Supton, A. Allen, New York City; William Zwickler, Bronx; Sarah Levine, Brooklyn; Mrs. R. Festhers, E. Tublin, Nancy Minissale, Frances Vella, R. Korenlich, Rose E. Kanter, New York City; Sylvia Haber, Providence, R. I.; Charles Landison, Helene M. Miner, Jacob D. Goden, Brooklyn; F. Schacht, Browns Mills, N. J.; Harry Eliasof, Bronx; Bernard Steir, Mount Vernon, N. Y.; Mollie Drucker, Bronx; Jerome D. Langen, Washington, D. C.; John M. Frantz, Arlington, Va.; Mrs. R. Brooks, Bronx; David Goldwater, Muriel Feuer, E. Jude Blen, New York City; Mrs. H. Sachs, Baltimore, Md.; Doris A. Ascher, Brooklyn; Ethel K. Hurwitz, New York City; Shirley Beinfeld, Brooklyn; John C. Heinrich, Camp McCoy, Wis.; Sally Feldman, Brooklyn; Jean Schiraga, Philadelphia, Pa.; Norman L. Adolf, Jackson Heights, N. Y.; N. J. Minor, New York City; Elaine Simon, Brooklyn; Mrs. Irwin S. Rosenfels, Oak Park, Ill.; Florence Horowitz, Brooklyn; Lewis Steinfeld, Bronx; Beverley Trachtenberg, Brooklyn; Helen Greenbaum, Jamaica, N. Y.; George N. Raybin, Bronx; Ida Seiden, Brooklyn; James Moyer, Brooklyn; Mrs. Charles A. Janeway, Weston, Mass.; Anita Kirkwood, Brooklyn; Christine Compton, Elizabeth Compton, Florence Cane, M. H. Cane, Arthur A. Halper, New York City; Anne Gadol, Brooklyn; E. Horowitz, Chicago; W. J. Donahue, Belleville, N. J.; Stanford H. Mirkin, New York City; David J. Monas, Pottsville, Pa.; Harold Lipshultz, Philadelphia, Pa.; Benjamin L. Hillson, Long Island City, N. Y.; S. Larson, New York City; Joseph A. Story, Brooklyn; Charles Mabrisso, Boston; Eugene Geiser, Oberlin, Ohio; Pauline Dichter, Astoria, N. Y.; Mrs. Morris Mason, New York City; Max Gross, Brooklyn; Lillian Palomino, New York City; Miss Jewenblatt, Bronx; Mrs. Hannah C. Katz, Brooklyn; K. Flowers, Co-

lumbus, Ohio; Sara M. Glantz, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. N. King, Washington, D. C.; Mr. and Mrs. J. Samuels, Ethel Kahn, Mrs. Pearl Ransom, Frances Besner, New York City; Samuel N. Ray, Forest Hills, N. Y.; A. Bakat, Brooklyn; Randolph Phillips, Pittsfield, Mass.; Mrs. A. Taub, Lisbeth H. Goodstein, New York City; Regina Hotha, Chicago; J. Ostrower, Woodbridge, N. J.; David Geller, Boston; Mary Dustan, New York City; Mrs. G. A. Hansen, Brooklyn; H. R. Leish, New York City; William Palinski, Racine, Wis.; Robert Pontridge, Brooklyn; George Hornby, Jane Werner, Vivian Rotolo, New York City; Helen Kemaltz, Astoria, Long Island, N. Y.; Anne De Stefano, Brooklyn; Colby Cleveland, New York City; Mrs. B. Rubin, Brooklyn; Miss R. Englander, Jersey City; Mrs. J. Schwartz, New York City; Etta Premingled, Perth Amboy, N. J.; A. Sealzo, Brooklyn; Constance L. Moerman, Falls Church, Va.; Edna Solomon, Murray Levinger, New York City; Philip Balaban, Bronx; Gartin Pippen, Saul Ascher, Brooklyn; Juanita J. Saddler, Cambridge, Mass.; Mrs. A. Ammirati, New York City; Martin Blumberg, Fort Monmouth, N. J.; Rae Schaffy, New York City; Mrs. Ben Yudenfreund, Brooklyn; Jeanette Shipper, A. D. Tinkel, Bronx; J. D. Hirsch, Newark; Mrs. Joseph Schwartz, Perth Amboy; Temmie Miller, C. Sloane, New York City; Rebecca P. Elliott, Esther Rubin, Philadelphia, Pa.; Welton Chipmanswain, New York City; Rosalie Shore, Philadelphia, Pa.; Leah M. Hoffman, H. Lennon, Mary C. Reick, Celia Gevelber, Rita Rullo, Katherine Richardson, A. M. Pulen, Sarah Kirstein, Ethlyn Schellak, Mary C. Hartzell, Rosemary Eitzen, Lola Casino, Elizabeth Davis, Mary Krasovitz, New York City; Ruth Fields, Rebecca Kopelsohn, Brooklyn; Harry B. Strebig, Lakewood, Ohio; Jeanette T. Dennis, Brooklyn; Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Gonzales, Bronx; Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Sherr, New York City; R. Siegel, Newark, N. J.; Elinor Woodruff Leland, Danbury, Conn.; Mr. and Mrs. Nathaniel Kelsa, Bronx; Mrs. M. P. Reynaud, Long Island City, N. Y.; Mrs. Arthur A. Cohen, Los Angeles; Mrs. M. M. Danovitch, Norwood, Mass.; Margaret F. Sloss, Aurora Aponte, H. J. Roth, Minnie Altmann, New York City; Elizabeth V. Schrack, Norristown, Pa.; Sally Zeitlin, New York City; Milton H. Solomon, Fort Meade, Md.; Wilbur U. Jones, Wheeling, W. Va.; Charles Goldstein, Frances Grusberg, New York City; Helen Morrisson, Gloria Sultan, Brooklyn; Henry D. Demling, Bronx; Mrs. W. S. Stachendorf, Brooklyn; Barbara Lichtenstein, Yellow Springs, Ohio; Ruth Chechanover, Brooklyn; Anna Lemling, Greenbelt, Md.; Jacob Auerbach, Mildred Auerbach, Brooklyn; Sarah Zaber, New York City; Vernon D. Sutchter, Camp Gordon, Ga.; Sidney Kaufman, Hope, Ark.; Elliot R. Cades, Philadelphia, Pa.; Elsie Goldberger, Perth Amboy, N. J.; Stanley Silverman, New York City; Edmund J. Pickup, Brooklyn; Mrs. Alice Fletcher, Glen Mills, Pa.; Leon Moses, Jr., Columbus, Ohio; Irving Krauss, New York City; W. H. Haight, Hackensack, N. J.; Mrs. S. Konigsberg, Shirley, Mass.; J. C. Miles, Cleveland, Ohio; M. Flachs, Newark, N. J.; Jack Shore, Frances Shore, Brooklyn; Bee Workman, Anne E. Morley, New York City; B. A. Bianchi, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. S. L. Washburn, Thomas Spikey, New York City; Samuel A. Weiner, Paterson, N. J.; R. M. Shanoff, Chicago; Mrs. L. Pears, Astoria, Long Island, N. Y.; Estelle Freedman, Brooklyn; Mrs. William B. Rosenman, New York City; Sidney S. Grant, Bertram D. Halperson, Boston, Mass.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to concern myself with the

comments on the political character of either the Republican, or Democratic, or American Labor Parties, made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] because I do not believe anyone else will pay any attention to his statement. But, I want the membership of this House to know one thing, that is, that the names singled out by the gentleman from Mississippi were the names of wives of American soldiers.

Everyone of those ladies whose name he mentioned in the RECORD the other day is the wife of an American soldier, either in a camp here or fighting overseas. It is my opinion, that when he makes targets of women of that character, women who have given their husbands for our war, it is hitting at genuine American patriots.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Ever since Adam and Eve had to get out of the garden, it has been the custom of a certain class of men to hide behind women's skirts. That custom still prevails, and if the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] wants to do that, as he did this morning, that is all right with me; that is his right.

Yesterday he said I was a "Rankin Republican," following JOHN RANKIN. I want to strike for independence now and say to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that I disagree with him wholeheartedly and completely when he said, as he did a few moments ago, that the party of the gentleman from New York, and the Communists, were pure and simple. Neither is pure, neither is simple.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of previous special orders today, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes at the conclusion of the other special orders today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LICK THE PLATTER CLEAN THIS CHRISTMAS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the declaration that we are going home for the holidays. I hope as we sit around our tables and enjoy ourselves we shall have the assurance—I know we shall—that all the men in the

armed forces will have turkey, too, with all the trimmings. We must not forget, however, that throughout the world there will be millions of hungry people who have not had bread or meat for a long time. We should conserve our food and share it with others less fortunate. Let us be mindful of them and lick our platters clean. It is the patriotic thing to do. Then to let us hope and pray that next Christmas the soldiers will all be at home with their loved ones with plenty to eat in all the world at peace, and then by the grace of God and by His help we will build a new and better world.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PROBLEMS OF THE EX-SERVICEMEN

Mr. HORAN. I see by this morning's paper that the other branch of Congress has passed a bill making an outright gift of from \$200 to \$500 to each discharged soldier. Being a veteran of the First World War I want to say that it will take more than that.

I wish to make plain my own conviction that it will take more than just money to rehabilitate our boys.

They must be made a part of our productive economy. A dollar spent in providing opportunities, or in preparing them to, grasp opportunities, will be worth ten times as much as a dollar laddled out to them without thought.

Capital credit and the availability of education are the keys to the future as far as the returning boys are concerned. Credit to assure a start toward whatever capital investments these opportunities require and available education to assure the knowledge and training that these opportunities may demand.

Let me say again that money alone will neither serve the best interests of the returning men nor solve the looming problems of the post-war era.

The solution, to my mind, is founded upon the fact that he who works makes work for others, and the influence is cumulative.

The task before us is to integrate each man with a fitting and congenial job into the pattern of the whole.

Mere money in one's pocket tends to promote idleness and in the negative sense we can say that he who does not employ himself at purposeful and useful tasks makes in the end unemployment for others.

The problem is before us now. Already tens of thousands of men have received their discharges, for many reasons, medical and otherwise. Some have tasted the bitter cup of our unpreparedness for a return to their civilian life. We must guard against that bitterness.

I would like to read you a letter received in my office. It is from another veteran of the last war:

DEAR WALT: On December 6, I was in the Seattle city hall trying to get enough gasoline to return home when I happened to overhear a remark from the sergeant of police to a young fellow. "This is no flop house," was the answer to a request for a place to sleep.

You could tell from looking at the fellow that he was no ordinary kid, and I asked him why such a request was necessary, why wasn't he in the Army, the Navy, or the Marine Corps. The answer I got put me in my place, because he spent most of his enlistment in New Guinea and Australia.

I was in the last war and do not believe every soldier I meet or hear sounding off, so in due course of time I asked to see his service record when he was paid off. This was it:

Bosley, Richard. Age 24. Weight at time of enlistment, 196 pounds. That was February 3, 1941.

Discharged at Salt Lake City, September 18, 1943. Weight 158 pounds. Rate of pay, \$56.

Wound caused by .25 calibre bullet, right leg, in action in New Guinea, Forty-first Division. Wearer of Order of Purple Heart. Sent to Australia after wound for treatment. Further transfer to the States for disposition.

After 2 months in hospital called before "survey and disposition" one day, signed off, and next day sent on his way with 300 other casualties to civilian life. Transportation and meals furnished to Spokane, Wash., from Salt Lake and turned loose with \$31.03 in his pocket.

Tried to return to his old job with Safeway Stores, but was turned down, simply couldn't hack a job like that. Turned down by Boeing for the same reason.

Fortunately this story has a happy ending. When the facts were learned, I bought this boy some clothes, got him a room, got him cleaned up, fed him for a couple of days, and got him back into normal thinking lanes, and then took him to Hanford and got him a job with DuPont, working as a guard.

The damndest thing about it all is that we can give millions of dollars to build a maternity hospital in South America to raise a bunch of "mañanitas," but not a cent for the rehabilitation of the boys who have given everything. Gone into the ash can are the promises to take care of the boys.

Eric Johnston states in the paper today that 17,000 a month are being discharged from the service and no facilities are under way to take care of them. Let the word get back to the troops on the lines that the boys are "getting the works" from the Government, and the morale of the United States armed forces will not be worth a tinker's damn.

The time for taking care of the wounded soldiers is not after the war, but now. The problem is not in the future. It is here now.

CLARENCE DURHAM.

And here's part of a letter from a former veteran, again in the service. He writes from New Guinea:

I have confidence, that as an ex-service man, you will give it the attention it deserves. The bonus we received in the last war never struck me as being the answer to a serviceman's prayer.

And that letter is from Frank Stark, boatswain's mate, first class, with the Fleet in the South Pacific.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, is it the gentleman's opinion that if we pay just in the form of money as an excuse for a greater duty that may fall upon us and in that very act we are admitting our own weakness?

Mr. HORAN. That is right. Any bonus should be administered with intelligence.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does it not seem, though, that if a flat payment were given to the men it would give them a little opportunity to get some clothing and look about for a position? I think many of the men—in fact, I know—do not know their rights under the law.

Mr. HORAN. I agree with what the gentlewoman says. My idea is that we must make sure also that those positions exist and so regulate our economy that we create more rather than less positions and opportunities. The mere putting of money in the pocket without assuming this greater responsibility is to me shortsighted and unworthy of our heritage as Americans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Training should be given to the men not only after they get out of the service but training while they are still hospitalized in order to fit them in every way for their duties in civil life. I introduced a bill which I believe the gentleman would approve, and which would provide pay while they are in the hospital or until they get their cases rated for compensation or else give them a terminal furlough so their pay would continue until they were given final rating.

Mr. HORAN. That is a good thing, but we must do more than that; we must assure them employment after hospitalization, after training, after educating. We must be conscious of our responsibility and act with both objectives in view.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And with war industries closing, as they are, civilians are out of employment, and it is that much harder for the veterans.

Mr. HORAN. We are on the threshold of the need for some real reconversion of our economy for civilian or peaceful needs right now, I believe.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is not the primary need these veterans face and the primary problem that faces us, real employment for the soldiers when they are mustered out?

Mr. HORAN. Yes. My own theory, and I express only my own opinion in this matter, is that quite often the bonus is something the soldier looks at as a tangible matter, and it tends to cloud his vision as to what his greater purpose in our Nation should be.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I agree with the gentleman, but my real question is this: Is not the real problem facing this Congress one of providing employment? Is not that paramount to the bonus question? The bonus is something that can be had at any time.

Mr. HORAN. Yes. The bonus should be only a stopgap.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. We will do it; there is no question about that, but we should get busy and provide them employment.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Is it not true that the bonus may becloud the issue as to what the soldier is entitled to? It may becloud the issue that faces the Congress and make them tend to forget the greater problems once they have granted the bonus.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does it not seem fair beyond question that the soldier should be given mustering-out pay? I do not like the word "bonus"; it is not a bonus. It seems to me that pay is the thing that should be given to them. Bonus has always seemed to me to indicate something not earned. Certainly the veterans have earned it.

Mr. HORAN. The gentlewoman is correct. We must help our boys to help themselves, with credit capital, educational facilities, and what lump sums we give them should be honestly labeled as the gentlewoman indicates.

Our job is to make the returning boys a working part of a working America. Anything short of that will be fatal.

Mere doles of money can make but a minor contribution to the achieving of that end.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a poem which came to me through the mail dedicated to the All-American Gwibit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MORALE IN THE SOUTHWEST PACIFIC

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to continue blinking the fact that morale among some of our forces in the Southwest Pacific and Asia is being subjected to almost superhuman strains. The admitted toughness of our Japanese adversary is not the reason. Our men are the equals of any in the world.

The two chief causes are, first, the evidences on every hand that so many of us at home do not yet realize that this is an all-out, total war, and requires of us the same devotion and discipline, the same willingness to accept sacrifices of our comforts and our conveniences as we expect our men to make of their blood and toil and nerve.

The second factor is their approaching exhaustion, physical and particularly emotional, as a result of almost endless months without relief, and, even more, without any definite prospect of being relieved in any foreseeable future. Men can unwaveringly tread a road, no matter how hard, if they can see a definite turn up ahead. I believe we have reached a

point where our military leaders must consider the assignment of a larger share of our growing shipping for replacing these troops to be as important as the transport of munitions. Men must be given guns and planes—yes, but guns and planes must also have fresh men more frequently than is now the case.

The situation is described most fairly in a letter written to his mother by a Minnesota boy who has been in the Pacific almost 2 years. May I read a portion of that letter:

You sent a clipping on the observations of Senator Lodge and others who have visited different areas in the war zones. I think it's time, high time, that plans are made to relieve the early troops. Two years is more than enough. Since America has elected to whip Germany first we necessarily are giving Japan the kind of opportunity she wants to develop a strong inner defense and develop the industries and economies with which to fight a long, delaying, attritional war.

I don't believe we have enough for quick victory. It can't be expected of a man that he go on and on year in and year out under these conditions without becoming bitter. Lodge says relief will make better soldiers, simply because we can go home, gratefully appreciating the loyalty of the American people. Without relief there may arise unhealthy and radical bitterness. Then, too, a man works better and more efficiently with a set deadline. He has a day to look forward to; he will speed it with occupation. I don't want you to think of this as complaining because it isn't. I'm simply asking that the reasonable thing be done, and Senator Lodge believes it reasonable and practical. He says we have the troops and the ships. It's not easy to take—reading letters that tell of fellows back there on furloughs every few months—going to school on the Government—striking from labor without sanction of the guys over here—striking for colossal wages. Would you permit us to do that? No; of course not; it's unthinkable.

Yet this is a war of all people. Not a battle between two mercenary armies. Patriotism today means to me not a struggle for geographical America but a struggle for the decent people in it. Under the circumstances you can understand the growth of disillusionment and bitterness here when we read about some of the goings-on at home. If I were on a Minnesota farm, where I could drink fresh milk, eat palatable food, I'd be willing to help feed those who continue the fight here. I should ask for nothing more, and because I know what this is like, I wouldn't be wanting to strike.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Kansas [Mr. WINTER] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order. There were other Members ahead of me, I went out

and when I got back I found that I had been passed. May I renew my request to address the House for 15 minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY FOR SERVICEMEN

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, a tremendous campaign is being waged throughout the country to provide mustering-out pay for the soldiers who are being discharged in this war and the demand is that this legislation must be enacted by the Congress immediately. They want it enacted before Christmas. The fact is if this Congress were to pass that legislation today no pay checks could be put out to the men who have been discharged within less than 6 weeks. So that you cannot consider this thing in the light of an emergency either for today or for tomorrow or for Christmas Day or for some other day. As a matter of fact, the great volume of men coming out of the service may not come out for another year or a year and a half, so that an immediate need does not exist. I think that the Congress should move slowly in enacting this legislation. Because of the fact that some criticism has been leveled at the Committee on Military Affairs for not having already reported to the House legislation on this subject, I feel some justification of this delay should be made.

The chairman of the committee, Mr. MAY, of Kentucky, has been called home by reason of the death of his nephew, who was recently killed in the crash of an Army plane in California. Before leaving Washington Mr. May directed that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] should call a meeting of the full committee in the event the special committee was prepared to recommend legislation on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Military Affairs has held hearings on the matter. The special committee that has been appointed to go into the subject very thoroughly and to consider the various pieces of legislation that have been introduced, has held several meetings. I may say that there are any number of proposals being made at this time to provide all sorts of different types of benefits for the men when they are discharged from the service. It is a duty we owe this House to study the various proposals before making any recommendation.

In connection with the mustering-out-pay proposal, the suggestion has been made of \$300 per man. With 12,000,000 men in the armed services this means an expenditure of \$3,600,000,000. I want you to bear in mind that the adjusted-service compensation paid to World War No. 1 veterans, over which there was such tremendous controversy throughout the country, amounted to \$3,790,000,000.

practically the same amount of money you are proposing in the mustering-out-pay bill at the present time. The \$300 proposal is five times the amount that World War No. 1 veterans received on being mustered out, namely \$60.

The biggest evil of this campaign that is now being conducted is the confusion that has been created in the minds of the public and the confusion that has been sent to the men overseas and the men in the services everywhere because the mustering-out pay has been confounded with disability compensation, hospitalization, and similar things that are due our disabled veterans. This Congress has done everything within its power to provide the necessary legislation to take care of the disabled veterans of this war. Unfortunately, there has been a great deal of paper work necessary to take care of these cases. As a result some delays have ensued, but the Veterans' Administration is working today with the War and Navy Departments to expedite the handling of those cases. There are approximately 80,000 or 85,000 cases being considered at this time by the Veterans' Administration. They estimate that within 30 or 40 days every one of those disabled cases will have been rated by the Veterans' Administration and the men will be receiving their pay checks or will be admitted to hospitals in those cases where they are entitled to hospitalization.

They have set up additional rating boards in the Veterans' Administration and they are endeavoring to get the personnel necessary to create more. The Army is arranging to consolidate their mustering-out centers for disabled persons so that it will be more convenient and so that it will be possible for the Veterans' Administration to have a rating board at each one of these mustering-out places. In that way no disabled soldier will be discharged from the service until he has been rated by the Veterans' Administration and his papers are put on file with the Veterans' Administration. Everything is being done to expedite this matter.

Because of the fact a few disability cases have not been promptly rated, and because this has been confused with the mustering-out-pay proposition, great confusion has resulted, but no harm is being done or will be done by the fact a delay may ensue in the enactment of mustering-out-pay legislation. The great majority of the 630,000 who have been discharged from the Army are able-bodied and have been able to obtain civilian employment. They did not ask for, they did not request any mustering-out pay. The same is true of practically all of those who are now coming out of service with the sole exception of the disabled veterans and they will be definitely taken care of by legislation which this Congress has already enacted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be able to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am sure that the House of Representatives appreciates deeply the work of the gentleman's committee in this matter. I wonder if the gentleman and his committee have considered advising the War and Navy Departments not to release disabled veterans until they have been rated and their compensation arranged for?

Mr. COSTELLO. I may say to the gentleman that we had representatives of the Veterans' Administration, the War and Navy Departments before the special committee yesterday morning. We went into that matter and we find that they are endeavoring to definitely work a program so that no disabled veterans will be discharged until they have actually been rated by the Veterans' Administration and definitely taken care of. Unfortunately, some have been let out of the service who were disabled but who were not in direct need of hospitalization. No hospitalized veteran has been discharged from the Army and sent home unless it was at his own request. There have been some cases where the soldier has insisted on being discharged and being allowed to go home because perhaps the parents thought they could give him better treatment at home. Some of those have been discharged and sent home. Their papers may not have been processed by the Veterans' Administration. But within 30 or 40 days every one of these 80,000 or 85,000 disabled veterans, whose cases are pending, will have been rated by the Veterans' Administration and the difficulty will have been completely solved.

Mr. HINSHAW. It appears that the War and Navy Departments have been placing upon the retired list disabled officers. It seems to me that some time ago we passed a law to provide for disabled officers so that they would be treated in the same way disabled officers of the Regular service are treated. It does not seem, from the evidence that I have had presented, that that course is being pursued by the War Department now, but, on the other hand, these disabled officers are merely placed upon the inactive list of the Reserves instead of being properly compensated and taken care of.

Mr. COSTELLO. I am not familiar with definite facts regarding that particular situation.

Mr. HINSHAW. I hope the gentleman will take a careful look into that situation.

Mr. COSTELLO. I will be glad to do that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I can only judge by past performances and results. It is true that we have had this

legislation for the disabled servicemen and women on the statute books for months, but the Veterans' Administration did not rate the cases properly. I have received word that they are not being rated within 30 days as stated by the gentleman from California after conference with General Hines. I am delighted the gentleman's committee is taking that up. I have been fighting and fighting for prompt adjudication and just rating of cases for months.

Mr. COSTELLO. I want the gentleman to understand. I did not state that the cases in the past had been rated in 30 days, but that current cases now pending will be rated within 30 or 40 days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I may say, that we have special orders following the gentleman from California.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that he may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Out of the 635,000 men who have been honorably discharged from the service, only 27,000 cases have been given service connection. There are 60,000 cases that have been non-service-connected. The Veterans' Administration did not ask for enough personnel promptly enough and the situation is inexcusable. I hope and trust that something constructive is being done at this time.

Mr. COSTELLO. I must disagree with the gentleman when she says it is inexcusable. The Veterans' Administration has endeavored to remedy the situation. A rating board consists of a doctor, a lawyer, and a third person. The great difficulty today in getting new rating boards is trying to find additional doctors. That is an almost impossible task. But they are endeavoring to solve that problem and they have set up 150 rating boards that are capable of handling 20 cases a day, so that within 30 to 40 days they will have handled the 80,000 to 85,000 cases now pending. They will be cleaned up. In the past it has taken 2, 3, 4, or 5 months. There has been some difficulty in getting all the necessary information, medical records, and so forth, but both the War and Navy Departments are cooperating with the Veterans' Administration and are trying to expedite the matter. I think they will definitely get it straightened out very shortly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Up to now there have been practically no contact men in the hospitals and no rating boards.

Mr. COSTELLO. That is being remedied.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In the Veterans' Administration they are 300 doctors short. Nothing is being done to insure proper medical service. They should be militarized in order to have the necessary number. They are 700 nurses short, they are short in the insurance section and in other sections of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. COSTELLO. The Veterans' Administration is aware of the fact they are short-handed and it has been trying to get additional personnel to take care of the difficulties but that is not easy to do at the present time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then it should have taken the matter up with other departments and the necessary personnel secured, because our primary duty and responsibility today is the veteran. I suggested to General Hines at a hearing before the World War Veterans' Committee weeks ago that the Veterans' Administration employ discharged service men and women. So far as I can ascertain—I have been going into hospitals for service men and women—I find while they are hospitalized their care is good. My contention is that where they are discharged they are not given their rights under the law. The administration of the legislation has failed. But, of course, no legislation for mustering-out pay has been passed and that is the responsibility of the Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

INTERNAL SOLIDARITY

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is a matter I have felt for some time we ought to consider. We ought to take under serious consideration the increasing evidence of trends toward internal disintegration.

One great strike is threatened, and others are in the picture. Too much interdepartmental friction is apparent. There is considerable friction between administrative agencies and the people, friction between the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

As we approach the coming election, the strain upon internal solidarity in this country is going to increase. I do not mean that these things have grown to perilous proportions yet. I mean that, actually and potentially, the situation is sufficiently dangerous as to challenge the deepest, most apprehensive concern of everybody, and especially those in official responsibility, Members of the Congress, and those of the executive branch of the Federal Government. I believe I will add, more especially, the people. This is their Government. Their boys are fighting this war. They suffer first from lack of teamwork at home.

What is the cause of all this? Of course there is some politics, some taking advantage of the war to get individual and group advantage, to forward some

notion of ideology, ambition, hunger for power. There are many things. But as the situation and causes diagnose out, if I may use that expression, it is clear that we do not actually fully realize we are engaged in the dangerous venture as one of the most important and most involved participants of a great global war, the most destructive of all time, and therefore we are without the unifying, solidifying, vitalizing one-purpose-giving realization of the transcendent perils of such a situation. There is nothing which unites and gets a people on the job like the realization of a common danger. We are robbing ourselves of the strength and oneness-of-purpose and national solidarity which is the natural contribution of the realization of a common danger. The conflicts in this country could not occur if we had an intelligent appreciation of the danger into which we have moved ourselves. We are all in the same boat. We confront this situation not as Democrats or Republicans, nor as management or labor.

I am somewhat embarrassed by this talk. I am not posing as an example or lecturing anybody. I do not think anybody in this House will charge me with being intensely partisan. This House is not partisan under the challenge of a great patriotic duty. I have never seen the time yet in this House when the country was imperiled that we had any dividing line that ran through the center of this House between the parties. I do not see how anybody can fail to be conscious of the fact that weak spots, some definite changes are developing in the national solidarity which, unless arrested, could put this country in very great peril. Among other evidences of the truth of what I say we are confronted now with the prospect of two major strikes. Now I do not say that these people who may go on strike are primarily responsible. Let us leave that out. That is not the way to approach this thing. The purpose which I have in mind would be destroyed if we should try to fix responsibility upon any particular group. The fact is, it does not belong upon any particular group. Let each of us assume his share of responsibility and his share of duty. We want results. We must do justice all around. We must do justice to those at home. Above all we must do justice to our men who are fighting and dying now while we are secure behind the protection which they afford.

Now let us see what is the picture. Here is the country at war. It is a terrible, bloody, destructive war. Our boys are on nearly every battlefield of the world. We ought to know by now that we are not going to march in a sort of grand parade to a glorious victory, strutting our stuff across the pages of history as we once seemed to our great cost to believe, quickly eliminating Germany and wiping Japan off the map in a few weeks. It is a long, bloody road to Berlin, and probably a longer, bloodier road to Tokio. It will be a longer, bloodier road because, in the initial stages of this war, our swell-headed egotism made us incautious, and

not unitedly, with a single purpose, on the job. Egotism breeds incaution and incaution invites disaster. We have not yet entirely gotten rid of incaution. If we had, we would not be taking the chances that we are taking. It would seem that we paid a high enough price at Pearl Harbor to cure us of taking chances. In one Sunday morning we lost domination in the Pacific. One incautious morning we lost the chance of a quick victory there.

Suppose in a small, isolated village, a fire broke out in the middle of the town, imperiling every single building in that village. The people would rush together. They would have but one business. They would be united by the realization of a common danger. The young men would go up on the roof where the fire was coming through and where the danger is. Some people would man the town pump and others form a bucket brigade. Everybody in that community has but one business at the time, and that is to put the fire out as quickly as possible and get the boys off the roof as quickly as possible.

Our boys are at the point of danger, of a greater danger. Our boys are on the roof. Some of them are falling through and being consumed by the flames. They had to go there. We put them there. They went gladly, bravely. They are fighting courageously. They are dying gloriously. They have got to have ammunition. The factories have got to operate, the mines have got to operate. The trains have got to move. What do you suppose the people of the village would think if somebody quit manning that pump and if those manning the pump said, "Well, we are not going to pump any more water; nobody else shall pump any." The boys up on the roof and every house in the village are in peril. Suppose the ones who were carrying the water said, "We are not going to 'tote' any more water, we do not like something that is going on." They would not do it. That is a point I am trying to make. Human nature is the same. The explanation that the other fellow is meaner than I am will not stand up. Maybe he has too much power. Maybe he got it too quickly. Maybe at the time when he needed the statesman to apply the brake, the politician applied the accelerator because the politician could ride him into office. Too fast, maybe, and he ran away from the support of public opinion and brought in peril both his own and the public interest.

We have got to be fair about these things if we are to get the needed result. Whether intended or not maybe we have put a premium on strikes. The point I am trying to make is that we will get nowhere by denouncing the other fellow for being meaner than we are. It might not be so. We are all going to have to live with ourselves and with our neighbors on this proposition.

What sort of fix would the man who would not carry the water be in when he met the neighbors down the street and the neighbors said to him, "My boy

did not come down off the roof that night because the water played out." I want to emphasize the fact that it is the duty of the other people to see that there is a square deal as nearly as possible for the people at the pump and the people carrying the water. We shun responsibility if we fail to do that. These things which supply our fighting men must be kept going, not only for the sake of our boys, but for the sake of those in these industries. It is a matter of life and death to these boys and for their country that the flow of war material is not interrupted. The longer we protract this war the more of our boys will have to die. The longer the war goes on, the greater the danger that some new machine of destruction may be developed which will make largely obsolete other engines of war. The longer the war goes on, the greater the danger that a stalemate may develop, in which, while we may not be conquered, we will not be able to force our enemies to surrender.

I have been observing this so-called optimism all along. Going around here telling people we are bound to win, how many planes we are going to make, that we are going to do this, that, and the other thing, as though the war would await the conclusion of our program or depend upon its execution. That sort of psychology is all right for a war-tired people in danger of folding up, but not for a people just going into war. Our only sensible program is to do our level best concentrated on the one job. I have examined human reactions. Nothing on earth will get a people on the job as quickly and unitedly as the consciousness of a common danger. People do incredible things in such circumstances. The truth of the situation is this: All we have and all we can hope for is in danger.

People who have common sense, dealing with the most ordinary practical affairs of life, when they have as much involved relatively as we have in this war they do not go around acting as we are, prophesying how soon the war will end—in our favor, of course. Going back to the village fire, practical, common-sense people would say, "Let us put the fire out and get the boys down from that building as soon as possible." The blacksmith working in his shop would be making something with which to help fight the fire. The merchant would only be selling something to help fight the fire.

Our boys are dying in the jungles of the islands of the Pacific because we were asleep that fatal morning at Pearl Harbor, with no apparent realization of the danger that was naturally moving in our direction from what we were doing at that time, and the Japanese character well known to us. The people in France before the Germans struck the Maginot Line were divided, struggling for profit and social gains; they were going to pieces inside France before the Germans struck the Maginot Line, or they would never have broken that line. After that line was broken the men, women, and children of France worked until they dropped in their tracks, but it was too late.

Much of the war will not be won for the family whose boy does not come back home, regardless of the final ending.

I have a practical suggestion. We must establish a better cooperation between the House of Congress and the executive branch of the Government in the conducting of the war. This would not necessitate any surrender of independence. It would be the establishing of a more workable copartnership. This would not interfere with independence of individual judgment. It would necessitate no sacrifice in matters of principle or fundamental policy. It would not interfere with proper conduct in the selection of public officials. We would only have to keep in mind the one great dominant common job of everybody. People have got to settle this question. Public opinion has got much to do in the avoidance of these dividing and hindering things. There is a most definite limitation upon what can be done in our present situation by the mandate of legislative bodies.

The fact that we are having these interdepartmental feuds, at least that is the direction of the drift, conflicts between patriotic citizens and administrative agents of the Government, and these threatened suspensions on a large scale of activities essential to the prosecution of the war, warn us of a deep underlying danger of the first magnitude. The quicker we realize and face the facts, the more sensibly and safely we will be acting.

As we close for the Christmas recess we face a major strike which, if engaged in, will largely paralyze the productive energy of the Nation. I am not here just to hear myself talk. I am conscious of the fact that I am talking to the people who speak for my Nation at a time when my Nation itself and my Nation's boys are in peril. If we begin to have these strikes all over the country right now we will have on our hands the rich red blood of our American boys who are dying on the battlefields of the world because we have not done our job. I mean it. It is a solemn hour, men. Why, the idea of us now confronting the possibility of coal ceasing to come from the earth, coal which is necessary to produce the vital energy that will give our boys the stuff to fight with when they are on the far-flung battlefields of the world, is a monstrous thing to consider. The idea of this threat to paralyze the transportation of this country at a time when our boys are dying on the battlefields of the world is monstrous to think of. The responsibility is ours as a people. I do not want this to be a one-sided presentation. It is also monstrous if we should fail to give the men a square deal. I am trying to help get necessary results. I have been here a long time. I think I know something about reading the signs of the times. If I do not misread the signs of the time, dangerous influences of disintegration are at work in this country now at a time when this country needs the greatest strength, the greatest solidarity, and the greatest unity of purpose that it has ever had

with perhaps two exceptions in its whole history. We must counteract them. I know of nothing comparable in effectiveness to the realization of our common danger.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted the following conference report on the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, for printing in the Record:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3598) "making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 22, 23, 26, 27, and 94.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 13 and 39; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8. That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum "\$100,000", proposed in the House amendment insert: "\$75,000, of which \$20,000 shall be allocated to the Federal Board of Hospitalization"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House amendment insert the following:

"The Comptroller General of the United States shall make a study of the proposed centralization of retirement fund records in the Civil Service Commission, both from the standpoint of statutory requirements and the sufficiency thereof for accounting purposes, and shall submit a report thereon to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives within 90 days from the date of approval of this act."

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum "\$1,695,000" proposed in such amendment insert: "\$1,550,000"; and in lieu of the sum "\$100" proposed in such amendment insert "25 per centum"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION"

"For an amount in addition to the \$20,000,000 appropriated under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act,

1944, and for the same objects and subject to the same conditions, \$6,500,000; and the limitation of \$60,000,000 in the authorization and direction to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make advances, contained under this head in said Act, is hereby increased to \$97,500,000."

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum "\$2,800,000" proposed in such amendment insert: "\$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert: "306"; and renumber the preceding section by striking out the number "306" and insert in lieu thereof: "305"; and the Senate agree to the same.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMETT O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. W. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill H. R. 3598.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee with respect to the report on two items. The first item I want to ask about is the item relating to \$50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate for community facilities. During the consideration of the conference report the other day, the statement was made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] that there is some \$13,000,000 at present in the fund and unallocated. Has any further or later evidence come before the committee or the conferees on that subject?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That information was contained in the Senate report, which is the latest data available. In the Senate report, a copy of which the gentleman, no doubt, has at hand, the statement was made that there was \$13,000,000 available and unallocated.

Mr. CASE. The reason I asked the question is that I have been told that without any funds being appropriated under this heading, the agency was without funds, and that a call would be made upon the appropriations which have been made available to the War and Navy Departments, to provide certain facilities essential to the prosecution of certain military projects. Personally, I feel that if those facilities are necessary, and if they are of a civilian character, they should be provided for under some other appropriation, rather than to call upon the War Department funds. A water

supply for a civilian residential area, where workers are engaged on military projects may be needed but, if necessary it should be provided by civil rather than military funds.

And since this agency has been set up to provide such facilities, and for the building of schools, and so forth, it does not seem to me that the War Department appropriation should be called upon for such purposes. What is done, if anything, in the report? Has the report changed previous action at all?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The House insisted on its disagreement to the Senate amendment, and in the conference the Senate receded and the amendment was stricken from the bill.

Mr. CASE. I should like to ask the gentleman then if it should develop that this agency is without funds, and there are certain facilities which are essential to the prosecution of the war effort that are of a civilian character, would the gentleman, as chairman of the deficiency subcommittee, receive evidence on that before letting the War Department appropriation be called upon to take care of providing those facilities?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As the gentleman knows, the Congress will be here in January. The Committee on Appropriations will be glad to consider any estimates, which may come from the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. CASE. The second question I wanted to ask relates to the item for irrigation for the projects proposed by the War Food Administration. What does the report disclose on that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. On that the original proposition submitted by the conferees, it was proposed to allow \$700,000. However, in conference we agreed to increase that to \$1,000,000.

Mr. CASE. As a compromise figure?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; \$300,000 more than originally suggested by the House conferees.

Mr. CASE. How much of that then will be for investigations, and how much for construction?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The limitation in the original amendment remains unchanged at \$800,000. We made no alteration in the language of the amendment, except to allow \$1,000,000 for all purposes of the amendment.

Mr. CASE. So that the division up to \$800,000 for investigation and surveys is within the discretion of the director?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. I trust it meets with the approval of my friend from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the conference report, as above set out.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this conference report represents a complete agreement on the part of the House and Senate conferees. The Senate receded from approximately \$113,-

000,000. The House receded on something like \$2,000,000.

There were 13 items in disagreement between the two Houses. On the first, an appropriation of \$175,000 for the Bureau of the Budget, we brought back a recommendation for \$75,000, of which \$20,000 is set aside for the Federal Board of Hospitalization.

On the second item, providing \$688,000 for the Civil Service Commission, for a central reporting system and a retiring record system, we struck out the money, but included an amendment providing for investigation of the subject by the General Accounting Office.

On Senate amendment No. 13, which was in effect a part of the preceding amendment, the House receded and struck out the appropriation, pending the investigation by the Comptroller General, Mr. Lindsay Warren.

Under the Public Health Service item, providing for relocation of doctors and dentists to communities without medical and dental service, of the \$345,000 asked by the Senate, the House agreed to an appropriation of \$20,000, with provision for a 25-percent contribution by the local community or State.

On the public-works community facilities item, for which \$50,000,000 was included in a Senate amendment, the item I have just discussed with the gentleman from South Dakota, the Senate receded and the item was eliminated.

The Senate also receded on the \$9,000,000 asked for Puerto Rican relief.

The Senate also receded on the request for an additional \$50,000,000 for the National Housing Agency.

The Senate receded on the amendment providing for crop insurance.

On the Farm Security Administration amendment, \$6,500,000 had been asked for administrative expenses, and \$37,500,000 for loans. The House yesterday agreed to the \$6,500,000 for administrative purposes, but denied an appropriation for loans. However, in conference the House conferees agreed to an additional \$7,500,000 for loans, as well as the \$6,500,000 for administrative expenses.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman think we are following a rather untenable route there? We are setting up the overhead personnel, but they do not have the money to loan farmers to produce food with. From my contacts with the farmers in my district, their difficulties have been not having the money to make loans, rather than lack of personnel to carry it on. I wish the chairman of the committee would explain that to me.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Well, as explained by the proponents of the appropriation on the floor yesterday, the \$6,500,000 is needed for the administration of current loans. The Farm Security Administration has \$60,000,000 on hand available for loans. It was necessary, as was explained yesterday, that

our good friend Mr. Hancock should have sufficient administrative force to handle existing business and take care of the funds provided in the annual bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. But do I understand the gentleman to say there is \$60,000,000 available for loans for food production in 1944?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman will recall that in the regular annual appropriation bill, which we passed a few months back, we authorized \$60,000,000 for that purpose.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. How much of that money is available at the present time?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It was to be spent in 1944. We have given the full amount asked for overhead, \$6,500,000.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I realize the amount of money for the overhead, but the point I am trying to make is that my correspondence leads me to believe that what they are short of at the present time is money to carry on the 1944 loans. I realize that on the agricultural appropriation bill coming in after the first of the year, no doubt ample provision can be made to extend credit for 1944 outside of this. But I cannot figure out why we gave this \$6,000,000 for personnel and still only make a token appropriation as far as loans are concerned when the loan is the thing that is needed from my contacts with the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman will recall that on yesterday we were told—and the statement was based on evidence submitted in the hearings—that unless this extra \$6,500,000 to which the gentleman refers was appropriated it would be necessary for Administrator Hancock to cut his force in half. This money was provided in order to prevent any cut in his present force and to take care of the current business of the agency. There is no difference between the gentleman and myself as to the value and desirability of this appropriation, but the House on yesterday decided not to appropriate anything for loans. Notwithstanding the decision of the House not to provide any additional appropriations for loans, the House conferees today agreed to add \$7,500,000 for that purpose.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Is it not true that the real cause of this added appropriation for administrative purposes is because while Congress appropriated only \$20,000,000 for administrative expenses for the fiscal year 1944 the agency was permitted for the matter of several months to operate on a larger scale on the basis of \$26,500,000? They have so operated up to the present time and the funds are depleted. This additional money is essential if it is to continue its present setup. The funds do not provide for any increase in the size of the agency.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. If they had in the beginning consumed each month only one-twelfth of the adminis-

trative appropriation they would necessarily have been forced to decrease their staff; but they proceeded at the same rate as heretofore under an understanding which was entered into at the time. If at this late date they were compelled to operate upon the amount originally given them for administrative expenses, they would have to discharge half of their force.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The only reason I brought the point up, I wish to say to my distinguished friend from Missouri, was because I surely did not want to be in the position of going home at Christmastime "cussing" the bureaucrats and then having to admit that I voted \$6,500,000 more for the bureaucrats but refused to vote a dime to the farmers. How can I explain that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Unless the gentleman votes this additional \$6,500,000 for administrative expenses F. S. A. cannot service even the amount of money now available. If the gentleman supports this agreement he can tell his people he secured for them an additional \$7,500,000 above what the House voted on yesterday.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think it should be the \$37,000,000, myself.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But the House yesterday voted by a decisive majority to appropriate nothing. Under this report you get \$7,500,000 for nothing.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS. I should like to say for the benefit of the gentleman from Wisconsin that my information is that there is greater need for this money in some parts of the country than others, that in some parts the fund has been exhausted. There this emergency fund will be available, for those distressed areas. I understand that the State of Wisconsin is in such an area and that this money will be spent in those particular areas rather than prorated throughout the United States. Those States will be the favored States and will be greatly benefited by it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on the proposition to provide \$650,000 for the agricultural census, the House receded.

On the Bureau of Reclamation and Water Conservation projects, as I have explained in my colloquy with the gentleman from South Dakota, \$1,000,000 was allowed.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Did I understand the gentleman in reply to the gentleman from South Dakota a few minutes ago to say that \$1,000,000 is the total provided for this reclamation but that there is no

indicated division as to whether \$800,000 is for surveys?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; there is no change in the verbiage of the provision; the \$800,000 provision still stands.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is that \$800,000 is the top limit for surveys in this work?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is right, but a total of \$1,000,000 is appropriated for the purposes of the amendment.

On the McKellar amendment the Senate receded. The last amendment was merely a correction of a section number.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the chairman has described the provisions of the conference report. I just want to say that I yielded to the \$7,500,000 for Farm Security to make loans because that was the only way we could get a bill. It is not as big an amount as it might be and yet it is \$7,500,000 wasted if they continue to operate the way they have operated in the past. They have interfered with farm production and the production of food by putting people who were not competent to farm, putting considerable numbers of them on farms. Instead of being a help to the food-production program they have been a menace.

I do want to say this so that the House will know that we did not do so terribly bad. On this last conference the Senate yielded on amendments which total \$143,000,000, including \$30,000,000 for the Farm Security. The House yielded to the Senate on amendments put in by the Senate and left them in the bill at this conference today to the extent of \$9,350,000. The House yielded on items it had in the bill which the Senate had stricken out to the tune of \$739,000. I thought the House ought to have that picture to realize that we really had represented them to the very best of our ability.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to compliment the conferees of the House on the fine job they have done. This is something unusual, to cut the Senate down. The thing I wanted to know specifically was how much money there is in this bill for reclamation investigation?

Mr. TABER. There is \$1,000,000 for operations under the Wheeler-Case Act. There is a limitation that not more than \$800,000 may be expended for investigations. They can expend at most \$800,000 for investigations or they can spend none of it according to what the department concludes to do.

Mr. JENSEN. According to that, then, there is \$1,800,000 in this bill for reclamation.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. No; the total is \$1,000,000.

Mr. JENSEN. A \$1,000,000 total?

Mr. TABER. Yes; and of that million they may if they choose expend \$800,000 for investigations or they may expend

the whole \$1,000,000 on the construction of projects.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the matter was handled in a very fine manner.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, the House conferees have done the best they could. They worked hard. We were in session for nearly 3 hours and I think we did as well as we could under all the circumstances.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, unless some other Member desires to discuss the report, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING UNTIL JANUARY 31, 1944, THE PROVISIONS OF THE ACT OF APRIL 29, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 209, extending until January 31, 1944, the provisions of the act of April 29, 1943, making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the act of April 29, 1943 (Public Law 45), making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, is hereby amended by striking out the date "December 31, 1943" in section 1 and inserting in lieu thereof "January 31, 1944," and is further amended so that the funds appropriated by section 1 and not heretofore or hereafter apportioned by the Administrator among the several States pursuant to section 2 shall be available for expenditure by the Administrator for the purposes specified in section 3.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary in the act approved July 12, 1943 (Public Law 132), funds available to the War Manpower Commission for the current migration of Mexican or Canadian nationals under the auspices of the War Manpower Commission for industrial and railroad purposes essential to the war effort may continue to be expended during the fiscal year 1944.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I wish to ask the chairman a question. This resolution, Mr. Speaker, as I understand, and I will ask the chairman to correct me if I am wrong, is an extension of the provisions of the present Farm Labor Act that we passed last April, extending that act until the 31st day of January 1944, so that those laborers who have been brought in from foreign countries and are now here who are so urgently needed in California, Florida, and some other places at the present time, will not have to be sent back home because of the expiration of the act. It simply makes available until the 31st day of January 1944, unexpended balances of the \$26,500,000, reallocating the funds to a certain extent where it may be necessary so that it may work. Is that the picture as the chairman understands it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has outlined the situation correctly.

The difficulty arises due to the fact that this appropriation is not for the fiscal year but for the calendar year which expires on December 31.

The House passed a bill and sent it over to the Senate to take care of the situation but due to the fact that it cannot reach consideration in the Senate by January 1, it becomes necessary to pass this continuing resolution.

This resolution is necessary for two reasons: In the first place under this law we have considerable foreign labor in the country. We have labor from Mexico, from the Bahamas, and elsewhere, and would be faced with the alternative either of immediately taking them from the jobs where they are so desperately needed and sending them out of the country by the 31st of the month, or leaving them in the country wholly unsupervised.

Mr. TABER. And it is a fact, is it not, that the Senate Committee on Appropriations is absolutely unable to take this up before the 1st of January?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are advised by the members of the Senate committee that they are unable to take it up and it is necessary, therefore, to ask a continuation of the present law without change for 30 days to be financed with unexpended funds still available. These funds aggregate about \$6,750,000. Of this six or seven million dollars, about three is available for the placement of interstate labor under the Extension Service and about \$4,000,000 for use by the Food Administrator for the recruitment and placement of foreign labor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I ask the gentleman from Missouri if there has been any change in the situation since he told me yesterday that after the passage of this resolution there would, in the gentleman's opinion, be sufficient funds to continue the operation of the farm-labor camps?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There are ample funds to continue them for the period covered by this continuing resolution.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I understood the gentleman to say that the Farm Security Administration would continue to administer the work of these farm camps, is that correct?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No. The War Food Administration handles the camps.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The War Food Administration?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under our former colleague, Judge Marvin Jones.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And he will continue to do so?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Exactly as heretofore.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The money appropriated in the bill that is here appropriated is to keep these folks in the country in some kind of camp so that

they may be available when the work comes up for them?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. These men are already in the country and under employment at the present time. This will enable us to keep them on the job instead of having to send them back home before December 31.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Why is it necessary to send them home?

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman from Missouri will yield, I will answer that by saying that it would be necessary to send them home because it is absolutely impossible to get the bill which we considered here yesterday through the Congress before the 1st of January and there will be no recourse left to the officers in the Department except to send them home if their funds were definitely going to be out the first of the year. There are 40,000 of them, or a little better, actually working in California at the present time and two or three thousand Bahamans actually working on the citrus-fruit crops in Florida.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I see no reason why these laborers could not stay here. I think the committee and the House should bear in mind these men have come here in the past without any assistance from the Federal Government because there were ample wages and attractive wages for them in this country. We have always had from 40,000 to 50,000 men from south of the Rio Grande come into the United States as laborers. I noticed yesterday a statement from the Labor Department that before the end of 1944 there would be 2,000,000 men in the United States without jobs. I think this Congress ought to bear in mind the fact some of these 2,000,000 men may be returning soldiers and they will need a job instead of bringing people in from Mexico and the Bahamas to carry on this work. I hope we can see the end of this kind of program of subsidizing the workers of other countries. They come in anyway. Later on we are going to need these jobs for men in our own country.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. These men could not be brought in ordinarily due to the operation of the immigration laws. They have been brought in by the Government under every safeguard. They are Bertilloned and fingerprinted. We are under contract to return them as soon as the work period is completed. There can be no doubt or delay about their prompt return to their own country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question as long as this is not brought in so that we get a chance to read it. Is the provision in there that any of these men can go from their counties without the O. K. of the county agricultural agent?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no change in the law.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I say to the gentleman that I regret we did not have an opportunity to change that

because I think it is the wrong approach to the problem.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is not a matter before us at this time. The gentleman should have made the change at the time the law was enacted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION AS AN AGENCY OF THE UNITED STATES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SPENCE submitted the following conference report on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "February 17, 1944"; and the House agree to the same.

BRENT SPENCE,
THOMAS F. FORD,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
CHARLES L. GIFFORD,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,

Managers on the part of the House.

ALLEN W. BARKLEY,
FRANCIS MALONEY,
GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,
JOHN THOMAS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 103, extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 173]

Allen, Ill.	Burchill, N. Y.	Dingell
Anderson, Calif.	Busbey	Domenegeaux
Arnold	Byrne	Douglas
Baldwin, Md.	Cannon, Fla.	Drewry
Baldwin, N. Y.	Capozzoli	Eaton
Barden	Celler	Elmer
Barry	Chapman	Fay
Beall	Chipperfield	Feighan
Bender	Cox	Fellows
Bland	Cullen	Fenton
Boren	Curley	Fisher
Boykin	D'Alesandro	Fitzpatrick
Bradley, Mich.	Dawson	Flannagan
Bradley, Pa.	Delaney	Fogarty
Brooks	Dickstein	Fulbright
Brumbaugh	Dies	Fuller
Buckley	Dilweg	Fulmer

Furlong	Lynch	Scanlon
Gallagher	McCord	Schiffler
Gamble	McGehee	Schuetz
Gathings	McKenzie	Schwabe
Gavagan	Maloney	Scott
Gavin	Manasco	Shafer
Gerlach	Mansfield, Tex.	Sheridan
Gore	Martin, Iowa	Sikes
Grant, Ala.	Mason	Simpson, Pa.
Grant, Ind.	May	Slaughter
Gregory	Merritt	Smith, Va.
Harris, Va.	Miller, Pa.	Smith, W. Va.
Hart	Mills	Snyder
Hartley	Morrison, La.	Somers, N. Y.
Hebert	Morrison, N. C.	Starnes, Ala.
Heffernan	Mott	Stevenson
Hess	Mruk	Sumner, Ill.
Hill	Murphy	Sumners, Tex.
Holmes, Mass.	Myers	Tarver
Jackson	Newsome	Taylor
Jeffrey	Norton	Thomas, N. J.
Jennings	O'Brien, Ill.	Thomas, Tex.
Johnson	O'Leary	Tibbott
J. Leroy	O'Toole	Towe
Johnson	Peterson, Ga.	Treadway
Lyndon B.	Pfeiffer	Vursell
Johnson, Ward	Philbin	Wadsworth
Jones	Phillips	Ward
Kee	Pracht	Wasielewski
Kelley	Randolph	Weiss
Kennedy	Reece, Tenn.	Wene
Keogh	Reed, Ill.	West
Kilburn	Rees, Kans.	Whelchel, Ga.
Klein	Rizley	White
Knutson	Rodgers, Pa.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Landis	Russell	Wolvert, N. J.
Lane	Sabath	Wright
Larcade	Sasser	
LeCompte	Satterfield	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 261 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion by Mr. COOPER, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] that the conference report be considered at this time and the statement be read in lieu of the report?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that if objection is not made, the conference report will be brought up for immediate consideration, and that there will be 1 hour debate on whether the conference report shall be adopted?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is entitled to 1 hour. He may yield to whom he desires in that time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement as above set out.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the gentleman intend to yield 30 minutes of the time to me?

Mr. SPENCE. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Thirty minutes, to be distributed by me as I desire. I have some requests for time on this side.

Mr. SPENCE. I understand that I have control of the time. I will be glad to yield to the gentlemen as they wish. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan what time he desires to use himself.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have some requests on the supposition that I would have time to yield.

Mr. SPENCE. I understand that is not customary; that I have control of the time. I am willing to yield to the gentleman whatever time he needs.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield 20 minutes to me personally?

Mr. SPENCE. Will that take care of those on your side?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I doubt it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] can yield as much as he pleases to the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Michigan may yield as he feels disposed if there is no objection. If the gentleman has any proposition to make, the Chair will entertain it.

Mr. SPENCE. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan and I ask unanimous consent that it may be controlled by him.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Why does not the gentleman divide the time equally as has been the custom? Why does not the gentleman yield 30 minutes to me?

Mr. SPENCE. I think that is fair enough. I do not know that we will want 30 minutes on this side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky that in yielding the gentleman from Michigan 30 minutes, the gentleman from Michigan may be allowed to yield it as he sees fit?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this conference report involves simply a continuing resolution, continuing the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Senate resolution provided that the Commodity Credit Corporation should continue until February 29, 1944. The amendment passed in the House provided that it should continue until February 5, 1944. We have been in conference this morning and the Members on behalf of the other body stated the question was one that should be decided by them; that the bill in reference to the Commodity Credit Corporation which has been so vigorously debated, was under their consideration, and they needed time to complete the consideration. They insisted on the original resolution, that the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation should be continued until February 29, 1944, in order to give them time to satisfactorily dispose of the problem. We insisted on the amendment of the House. We refused to accept their date. In a spirit of compromise we split the difference and made it February 17, the date for the continuation of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I think that was a fair disposition of the matter.

It is a matter that certainly is not of great importance. Twelve days' continuation of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which gives it no additional powers, which does not change the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t" of existing law. That is the question that is submitted to you. I think it needless to say more.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no compromise of this nature on this subsidy issue. The House voted overwhelmingly by a majority of 160 to prohibit the payment of consumer subsidies. There is no reason why the other body of the Congress should not have been considering this issue since last October. A bill was introduced in the other body at the same time a bill was introduced in the House. They were companion bills. It has been the strategy of those who were in favor of consumer subsidies to delay the enactment of this legislation just as long as possible. I warned the House, as did many others, as late as last October, when the bill was reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency in the House, that it was the strategy of those in favor of the payment of consumer subsidies to delay this just as long as possible, and particularly to delay it so that we would be pressured up against the Christmas recess, in order that we might do just as we did last July, pass a simple continuing resolution without a prohibition against the payment of subsidies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you may yield to that strategy if you care to. I will not be a party to it. I did not sign the conference report.

A few days ago, when it became apparent that the other body probably could not get a quorum to consider the bill, although hearings on the bill had been concluded in the Senate, we were confronted with the condition. We said that because of this condition, because both branches of the Congress were desirous of recessing over the Christmas holiday, we would give the other body of the Congress 30 days in which to bring this up. That was a concession to a condition which existed in the Congress. They were told at that time that if they sought to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation without a prohibition against the payment of subsidies for 60 days, that that would be considered by the country and by the House, as a concession to those who favored the payment of subsidies. I believe that the other body of the Congress deliberately made this 60 days, knowing the attitude of the House, in the belief that they would split the difference and get as much time as possible to continue the payment of subsidies.

The payment of these subsidies is costing the taxpayers over \$100,000,000 a month. This matter has got to be settled as expeditiously as possible. At the present moment, the War Food Administrator gives as his reason for not announcing food programs, the fact that there is so much confusion in respect to this legislation. The War Food Administrator therefore wants this disposed of as quickly as possible. Who wants it continued? Those who are in favor of the payment of subsidies, and this is the strategy which they have been formulating since at least the 14th of last October, when this bill was reported out

of the Committee on Banking and Currency in the House.

There is no reason under God's heaven why the other body of Congress should not have been considering their own bill for the last 3 months. They did not consider the House bill before the committee. They considered the Senate bill. They refused to report the Senate bill out by a vote of 9 to 8.

Now, it is our responsibility. Because of the confusion on this issue, because of the gross exaggerations which are made in respect to this issue, because of the intellectual dishonesty which is apparent with respect to this issue, because of the fact that, if we adopt this conference report, it will be hailed on the radio and in the press as a great victory for those who are in favor of the payment of subsidies, this conference report should be voted down decidedly.

It is the responsibility of the other body to act expeditiously in this matter. We have seen that other body act on major legislation with less than 5 minutes' debate. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] on yesterday called attention to the fact that there was no opposition to the 60 days' continuance of the Commodity Credit Corporation, because there has not been any debate in the Senate. They did not debate this issue. Now, by voting down this conference report, we at least compel the other body of the Congress to give the same consideration to this problem that you and I have been giving to it since last June.

What happens to the Commodity Credit Corporation if we vote down the conference report and the Senate does not act? The same thing which happened last June and July when they forced us into exactly this same situation.

The resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation after June 30 of last year did not become law until July 16, 1943, when the President signed Public Law 151; and the same thing might happen to Commodity Credit Corporation again. So it is not absolutely essential that we vote this resolution today to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation. This matter will be disposed of within a reasonable time after we reconvene, and no more danger to the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation will result from a failure to act on this than resulted last July when for 16 days the Commodity Credit Corporation was without legal life. Every lawyer in this House knows, of course, that they can continue their present commitments during the so-called liquidation period and that any legislation following that can be retroactive to pick up the life of that Corporation as of December 31, 1943. They cannot, however, if no resolution is passed, continue to make commitments and I do not think a majority of this House wants them to make further commitments.

It has been said here that they have agreed that they would make no new commitments on consumer subsidies, and thus we are not doing anything by defeating this legislation than they have promised Congress that they would not

do. In the meantime, pressure groups are at work on this legislation and every Member knows they are, and the longer this continues the more and the greater pressure will be brought.

In a letter of December 8, of which I have a copy before me, Chester Bowles, Administrator of O. P. A., had this to say:

Of course there are arguments against subsidies the validity of which I recognize. They will add to the tax burden and increase the national debt. They introduce new principles into American economy which have never before been experienced.

It should be decided definitely and as expeditiously as possible whether this Congress wants to adopt as a philosophy of government these new principles to which Mr. Bowles refers. He goes on to say:

There will be an immediate rise in the cost of living by an amount of 20 to 25 percent greater than the amount now being expended in subsidies.

I want to call attention to the fact that he stated the increase would be \$1,000,000,000, not the \$8,000,000,000 Mr. Bowles said in his statement to the press 2 weeks before that. That is what I mean by gross exaggeration. Mr. Bowles at one time for the purpose of getting votes for consumer subsidies said that it would increase the cost of living \$8,000,000,000, but in a letter written under date of December 8 he stated it would increase the cost of living by not to exceed 25 percent more than the amount now being expended in subsidies. The amount now being expended in subsidies is at the most \$800,000,000. It was 25 percent of that that he had reference to, so you have \$1,000,000,000 in consumer subsidies, but that means that \$3,000,000,000 must be raised by the people in taxes to pay it off. Mr. Bowles' argument was that the increase would set in motion a new wave of wage demands many of which doubtless would have to be satisfied.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

If you take the amount that is being paid in subsidies annually and divide it by the population you will come to the conclusion that it amounts to 2 cents a day per capita. For a family of five that is the price of one glass of beer for the head of that family a day. I believe it is an insult to the patriotism of every wage earner in this country for Mr. Bowles to say that labor is going to strike, labor is going to tie up war production merely because they have to curtail their beer consumption by one glass a day. How ridiculous that is. But this whole program is in such a position today that we cannot justify a continuance beyond the 30-day period. When the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] suggested February 5 I said that of course we would not quibble over a few days; whether it is the 1st of February or the 5th is not material, but any concession beyond the 5th of February is a decided yielding to the subsidy group and the groups which

are pressing every one of us and the administration to continue this program just as long as possible without a prohibition against the payment of producer subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, you may do as you please; you may run up the hill and run down the hill just as much as you want, but this to me is a matter of principle and so long as I have any part of the responsibility for the formulation of Government principles and policies I am going to stand up and fight for those which I consider to be sound so long as there is a breath of life in my body to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I have a very high regard for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], who has just addressed the House. I am sure his ability is acknowledged by almost everyone on both sides. The gentleman, I am afraid, is not living up to the high reputation and standard he has set here that has gained for him an almost universal feeling of respect and caused him to have this high standing in the House. He says he is fighting for principles. I can appreciate when a man has worked as hard as he against subsidies how he might be inclined to become—well, for want of a better word, "captious"—and yet if it is wrong to extend it for 60 days it is wrong to extend it for 1 day.

Now, what are we talking about? About the difference between tweedle-dee and tweedledum. What is a difference of 10, 11, or 12 days? If we are going to extend this thing why be captious about it? What difference does it make whether we extend it for a few more days? The gentleman is familiar with the legislative status here; he is familiar with the fact that this would upset the whole appellation over the mere question of an extension of a few days. I have a very high regard for the gentleman; I feel just as he does about this House upholding its part of the dignity of this Congress, but at the same time we have had a meeting of minds; one side has given and the other has taken; one side has taken and the other has given. This certainly is a thing that we can all get together on and I hope the gentleman will not press his point.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I spoke against consumer subsidies. I voted for the Steagall bill that passed the House, but in doing so I offered an amendment to clarify, as I understood the situation, the language of the bill which I thought prohibited the payment of producer subsidies, such as the beet-sugar subsidy. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] assured me that I was wrong. I had a very limited time to present the amendment. It was overwhelmingly voted down.

There are still those who do not think that the bill as passed by the House will permit the continuation of that program. I do not believe anybody in this House is opposed to it.

I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi that the compromise agreed upon by our conferees to give 12 more days is not a compromise of principle. These are critical days. Next year I believe will be the most critical year we shall ever see, and the thing that makes it critical is a spirit of discontent, a spirit of bull-headed obstinacy, a group movement that "I must have what I demand and will make no concessions to the viewpoint of the other fellow." We did a fine job in this House yesterday; there was unity of purpose and action. I would hate to see that record marred now just before we are going home to celebrate the anniversary of the birth of the Prince of Peace. The Senate has made a concession to us; they ask us to make a concession to them of 12 days only. We do not agree to go back on anything that we have previously stood for; we merely agree in a spirit of sweet reasonableness to meet the viewpoint of the other fellow just a little way, just 12 days. I frankly do not see how we can do any less. We must not go home and let the Commodity Credit Corporation die.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, how does the time stand?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan has 16 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Kentucky 22.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am standing beside a man for whom I have great affection, and even more that affection. I have great admiration for his great and unquestioned ability. I am sorry to see him now rather dissatisfied with what we did in the conference today. I thought I was emphatic enough yesterday and that we voted the way he must have appreciated in his absence. I must confess that when we met the Senate in conference this morning and they told us they probably would not return from the recess until January 10, and that they really needed a little time beyond the 5th of February, I thought it fair to yield halfway. They wanted 20 additional days; however, we finally induced them to reconsider. I did not think that in doing that I was working against the wishes of my friend from Michigan. Under the circumstances I have outlined, we tried to act fairly for the House. We are not now discussing the principle. The gentleman from Michigan cannot be less yielding on this question of the principle of subsidies. I still fear the result of the threat and the shaking the plum tree and the votes that might be changed. That was my speech on yesterday; that was the whole issue, it is the issue here today. I should like to add that what worries me a little, as the gentleman from Michigan suggests, is the way the newspapers pan us—and do they pan us! They pan us because

we do not stand up in our shoes and stop taking dictation from the White House. Then when we try to stand up in our shoes and vote our sincere beliefs, think what happens to us at the hands of the press as illustrated in this subsidy matter. We cannot suit the press. It is their method and joy to criticize more often than to commend. It is news when they criticize. This House has carefully weighed this matter of subsidies. We in the House have declared for an antisubsidy bill. As usual, the press largely takes the other side. It may be best to run down the hill a short ways, and I may have run up the hill pretty far yesterday. I can retreat a little when necessary and strengthen my position.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Would it be fair to inquire of the gentleman from Massachusetts if this conference report is signed by all of the conferees who were present at the conference?

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not like to have the gentleman put it that way. I think all signed it except the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. COOPER. Was the gentleman from Michigan present at the conference?

Mr. GIFFORD. He was there when I left.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say in closing that we are very proud of this man from Michigan. Just because I cannot follow him everywhere he goes, especially when he does not tell me where he wants to go, should not alarm him; but as I have before said to him and now repeat, How can I play second fiddle well when to me he will not tell? But I want him to know I am supporting him loyally on principle of the antisubsidy legislation. His personality and good judgment will continue to guide me. I do think highly of him. But in this case, I thought he might prepare to follow me.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the merits of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill are not in question in this resolution. It is simply extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which has done more for the American farmers than all of the other agencies of Government combined. The Corporation has been in existence now for 10 years. I remember in 1933 when corn and wheat were selling for 25 and 35 cents per bushel, when cotton was selling for 6½ cents per pound, the Commodity Credit Corporation was set up for the purpose of stabilizing the prices of agricultural products and made loans to the farmers in order for them to carry their surplus crops until they could sell them in an orderly way. So the question here is extending for a limited time the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which expires December 31 this year.

I am against certain types of subsidies; subsidies to roll back the prices to con-

sumers are unsound. I am for support prices and incentive payments in order to produce more war crops. The Commodity Credit Corporation bill which passed the House a few weeks ago did not change the benefits under the A. A. A. Act or the soil-conservation benefits. If we have to pay subsidies to consumers of this country when everybody has a job for the first time in a quarter of a century, what will we do when 25,000,000 or 30,000,000 people employed in making implements of war and 15,000,000 in the armed services of this country come back without jobs?

Mr. Speaker, we are not deciding that principle today. We conferees met this morning. We might not have a quorum on Monday. We must extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. As your representatives, we did the best we could. The Senate wanted to extend the life of the Corporation until the 29th day of February. I voted yesterday to extend its life until the 5th day of February. The best we conferees could do was to split the difference, and we agreed on the 17th of February. We have done the very best we could, and it is important that we vote now to sustain the conferees in order to extend the life of the corporation that has done so much for the American farmer. If not, on January 1 we will be without the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, at the outset, though I belong to a different party from my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], I am going to stand right square shoulder to shoulder with him on the matter of refusing to believe that the conference report coming back with an added extension of 12 days is a mere source of quibbling. I join him as a Member of this House in that it is a matter of principle, it is not a matter of quibbling. This is the first time since I have been a Member of this body that I have ever felt myself so moved as to say that even though a long vacation means as much to me as it does to any Member of this House, possibly more, and that as an individual for private reasons I have more reasons for wanting to be home than most of those who are anxious to go home, still I cannot believe that the public confidence of this Nation will be aided and strengthened by the House of Representatives coming to an agreement purely because of the argument that we are quibbling over a few days. It is more than that.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of the South of this great Nation and in the far West, the great State of California, have a right to know, in view of the fact the planting season is already upon them, as soon as possible just what is going to happen to this program. This Nation is entitled to the utmost in food production and, to use the Speaker's own words, in unity to both produce and fight more than it has ever done in its history. Surely the matter of settling the issue between the Houses, if there is any

quibbling over time it is set aside in view of the fact that an expenditure of billions of dollars was passed in the other body without going into the facts involved and the merits of the case in approximately 5 minutes, in the 35 days under the House amendment they cannot claim they will not have enough time.

No, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of putting before this country the fact that certain people are trying to saddle a gigantic octopus on this Nation which would sap the very virtue of its people, a virtue upon which its continuity depends, and which will sap the foundations from our American way of life that men and women both are dying to preserve. If this House is in too big a hurry to get home for vacation with conditions like that facing it, I will not stand up and argue that it is a matter of quibbling among friends over time. There is a grave difference of opinion between me and those gentlemen who consider this matter to be of such trivial significance that they would be willing to trifle with the intelligence of the American people further, and at the same time undermine their confidence in the one branch of Government which stands and should stand eternally vigilant over the price of liberty, and I refer to the Congress of the United States. It would be a sad thing indeed, if the decision were reached this afternoon because of the haste of Members in their desire to go home, to settle this matter and agree upon the little item of 12 days as being of such great importance that we have to do it upon that basis, yielding to the power of propaganda and publicity which we know so well will be used in this case, and at the same time further fixing this monster, this festering cancer already begun, still further upon the American people.

Mr. Speaker, if I vote alone in this case, I will vote the conference report down, and not up on the matter of the so-called adjustment based on 12 days, and take my chances in the forum of American reason on the issue.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I hardly think it is fair for my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] to try to leave the impression that the Members of the House are taking this action just to go home. I hardly think any fair-minded person in any man's district has not already recognized the fact that Members of Congress like to be home on Christmas Day the same as they do. But this is not for the purpose of going home.

We are nearing the close of a session. This session will be over on January 3.

The other body passed a resolution providing for 60 days. We passed it providing for February 5—35 days. In the orderly legislative processes in conference the matter is adjusted, which is done on many, many occasions and on every bill where there is a disagreement between both branches of the Congress.

From the farmer's angle, the extension is vitally important. Unless we do something by December 31 the Commodity Credit Corporation expires. Subsidies may continue thereafter under the R. F. C. So it is not a question of stopping subsidies. We know that between now and December 31 the chances of final action being taken in the present legislative set-up are remote so far as continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation Act is concerned. So that this very action and extension is of vital concern to the farmers of the country.

There is no controversy about the extension, no matter how we feel on subsidies; but if the act is not extended there is danger. Suppose the Senate did not act, or suppose it did and the bill was vetoed and the veto did not come until after January 3. The Commodity Credit Corporation Act has expired. Certainly none of us want that to happen. So the extension of the matter 12 days or 15 days, or whatever the adjustment between the two branches may be, is a minor matter and certainly should not be termed quibbling, but is a practical way of meeting a practical question confronting us.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said about the fact that we should adopt this conference report in a spirit of compromise. I was under the impression that on yesterday when the House agreed to the date of February 5 it represented a compromise. We all know that there was not any fight made in the House as to the adoption of that date, February 5. I think it was the general understanding of those who voted for that date that it did represent a compromise and that the Senate would probably agree to accept the date the House agreed upon. I am very sure if there had not been that impression prevalent there would have been a fight here in the House upon that resolution when it came before us yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, a good deal has been said about the difference 12 days might make. Twelve days at this particular time of the year, when farmers are outlining their programs for planting and sowing during the coming year, mean a great deal. We are all aware of the fact that Marvin Jones has twice stated publicly that it is imperative we pass this legislation now before we recess for the holidays; that is, that we pass legislation extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation and settling the question of subsidies, because until we do that the Food Administrator is absolutely unable to tell the farmers of the country what kind of a program they will have next year. The farmers cannot make their plans and proceed with their operations until they know what that program is going to be. So far as I am concerned, I dislike very much to see this thing go over even until February 5, because it is going to seriously interfere with our food program next year.

Twelve days can make a great deal of difference, 1 or 2 days might make a great deal of difference, and I think in all fairness to the Food Administrator we ought to insist that this question of subsidies be settled at the earliest possible date. The thing to do is to vote down this report and insist on the House's position.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon completion of the pending business I may be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes to explain the provisions of the soldiers' vote bill which I have introduced today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Mississippi, I, too, have great admiration for the gentleman from Michigan. I think we all do, but we are not discussing the merits of subsidies or the demerits. The only thing we are undertaking to do here is to carry out the Constitution of the United States. Our forefathers, in their wisdom, provided us with two branches of the legislative department and they said we had to agree on the identical language before anything became law. We followed the processes of the Constitution in this case and each House has conceded to the other an equal amount of the difference existing between them. So we have this conference report here and it is up to us whether we take it or reject it.

Suppose you reject it? Does that force the other body to consider the question of subsidies before the end of this session of the Congress? It does not. Does it insure the continuance of the Commodity Credit Corporation beyond December 31? It does not. You do not accomplish anything by rejecting this conference report unless you can force the other body to agree to your terms and they have already made as much concession in this matter as have the conferees on the part of the House. So it seems to me the part of wisdom and of common sense for us to adopt the conference report and come back here in the beginning of next session and undertake to settle this matter, which has so disturbed the Members of Congress and the people through the country. But we are not going to gain anything, in my judgment, by rejecting this conference report, except to upset further the people of this country who are dependent upon the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, because it is entirely possible that if we reject this report the Commodity Credit Corporation will go out of business on December 31, and we will make a bad situation worse.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I cannot quite agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] that a compromise should be made today. I think we made it yesterday. So far as I personally am concerned, we did make it. I was my intention to oppose any extension of time but I did agree to the date of February 5, upon the theory if that was the best we could do we would give the other body opportunity and time to work out a bill we could accept and adopt. I felt the need and urgency for immediate action. I feel it today. This Congress could and should have acted on this important measure before January 1. The country is going to hold us responsible for not so doing. We can talk about delaying it for just a matter of 12 days as though that were inconsequential. But remember that food is an essential and important item, not only for this Nation but for our allies. The farmers of this country must know what they are to do. It is all right to talk about it not making much difference, 12 days or 30 days, but it is most important when the next harvest season comes around to see that we have a food supply for people.

The farmers of our Nation are confronted with a labor shortage, a farm machinery shortage, and now you want to confuse and delay the planning of their farm programs. Any delay on this measure is inexcusable. Restrictions, red tape, regimentation have already hindered full production, and now you want to add confusion.

Those who favor this delay will and must be held accountable for any reduction in food production that results from uncertainty in securing early action on this legislation.

And that is what is at issue here today. That is one of the reasons why I do think we should vote down the conference report. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has taken a definite stand and I believe his stand is in the interest of our people.

Now something has been said about the extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I think it has been a most vital and effective agency for the agricultural sections of our Nation. But what happens if we do not extend it? What happened between July 1 and July 17? There was not any serious calamity. It will be taken care of as it has in the past. Therefore, I urge you this afternoon to support the position of the gentleman from Michigan.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the only thing I feel is of vital importance in this matter is to make certain there is no period of time during which the Commodity Credit Corporation cannot function at all. If that should happen, I want to testify that

there are thousands upon thousands of dairy farmers in this country, and some of them in my section, who today are able to produce only because they are in receipt of subsidies to cover their cost of production, or a portion of it. If there is not any Commodity Credit Corporation, I do not know how those men are going to keep going. Of course, this issue should be settled at the earliest possible moment one way or another, but those producers of vital and necessary commodities have either got to have higher prices or they have got to have subsidies to cover their cost of production, and if there is not any Commodity Credit Corporation in existence, until this basic issue has been settled, I do not know what those men are going to do.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the arguments advanced by the speakers of the majority party in trying to secure this additional extension of time in which to settle the subsidy question pretty well add themselves up to two simple contentions, one of which is, they contend there is no matter of principle involved, and the second one of which is that we ought to compromise with the Senate in proposing a delayed decision and meet them at some halfway point.

It is amazing to me that no speaker of the majority party except the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG], who is supporting the position of the gentleman from Michigan, no other speaker on the Democratic side today said one single thing about the most important issue, that is, the vital question of getting food at this critical time in the Nation's history. Nobody speaking for this additional delay seems to have been concerned about the necessity of supplying food to our allies and for the soldiers and for the people on the home front. They simply limit their arguments to two points, one a matter of principle and the other a matter of compromise with the Senate. Let us consider the arguments. The principal argument of the gentlemen of the majority adds up to whether it is tweedledee or tweedledum, according to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], only that and nothing more.

It seems to me, however, there is a greater principle than that involved, certainly, and that is the principle of whether or not the House is an integral part of this Congress and is going to respond to the demands of the people to settle this very significant problem of subsidies one way or the other at a very early date. The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Marvin Jones, our former colleague, has told us very candidly we are jeopardizing the entire food supply of this Nation if we continue to dilly-dally with this problem. No speaker of the majority side, as a matter of principle, has refuted that argument here this afternoon. An additional delay of 2 or 3 weeks can have a tremendous effect in the maturing of crops. In my State that much time, for

example, sometimes marks the difference between a bumper corn crop and a crop ruined by an early frost. We owe it to the farmers of America to settle this subsidy question, so that they can make the plans for their farm operations.

Now, as a matter of compromise, the Democratic speakers say, let us meet the Senate halfway. If we meet the Senate halfway on this conference report, this extension of time should go no further than January 31, because the House by its emphatic action a month ago said that subsidies should be abandoned after December 31. If we are going to compromise on a 50-50 basis, halfway to the time limit set by the 60-day extension would come in January, not on February 5. Yesterday I voted against it—an extension even to February 5. I think the subsidy question should be settled before the first of the year. However, on yesterday the House decided to extend the time to February 5 to meet Senate requests, and now they come back asking for additional delay.

The big difficulty with new dealers, Mr. Speaker, is that when they get into a situation involving mathematics, they get confused and bewildered. They cannot even recognize what 50-50 is. They do not know what a 50-50 basis is. First of all they give in to the Senate 50 percent, and then they divide the remainder 50-50 again, leaving the House one-fourth as a matter of practical application. I think that now is the time for us to take action in this question and that if a delay is to be authorized, it should certainly not defer the decision beyond February 5 at the most.

Mr. Speaker, the relentless march of the seasons goes on whether Congress meets or not and whether it acts when it does meet or simply adds up apologies for delay. Those who produce the foods and fabrics of America are entitled to know what the ultimate decision on subsidies is to be so they can plan accordingly. We must either stand by our guns, make an about-face, or accept some compromise solution. Whatever we do, it should be done soon so that the uncertainty can be ended and plans developed to make 1944 the greatest farm-production year in American history.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that it was precisely because we suspected that some such "squeeze play" as that now confronting us would be resorted to in order to defer and delay the decision on subsidies that a number of us late in October organized the drive-for-action committee to stop the procrastination and speed up the decision. At least partially as a result of this committee's insistence, the House met the issue clearly and candidly last month and took emphatic action on the subsidy question. Now the whole decision languishes over in another body of this Congress. I presume there is nothing the drive-for-action committee can do to inspire action in that other body, but today we shall vote to reject this conference report and to oppose granting still additional delay beyond February 5 in deciding this important issue. I hope that sufficient

Members of the majority party will join with us so that the conference report will be rejected. If it is, I feel confident the Senate will accept February 5 as the new deadline and that it will meet it. The Commodity Credit Corporation will continue to function in either case—the issue is simply and clearly one of devoting ourselves to the subsidy problem until it is finally and decisively decided for once and for all, so that we can get on with the job of producing the maximum from the farms of this Republic.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, we have about a five-way split on this proposition. If I should say what I would think about the two bodies of Congress, provided I thought either body or both of them would defer the 1944 food program for the mere purpose of going home to see their families, and mine has not been in this city for 2½ years, I say if I should say what I thought about that, provided I believed such a thing, it would be against the rules of the House to put it in the Record. So I will skip that part of it.

Mr. Jones has indicated that he cannot announce the 1944 food program because the 1944 food program has become involved in the Federal Treasury's activities, until we do something about the subsidies and about the Commodity Credit Corporation. So I do not believe that either House of Congress would stultify itself in delaying a program or a law beyond February 5 or beyond January 21 or beyond February 17, provided the two bodies can reach an agreement first as between their own Members and then as between themselves before that date. So extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is what we are talking about here, until February 17, does not say to me that Congress will take until February 17 to reach a decision. And if it does not take until February 17 to reach a decision, you will get action before that date. If Congress decides by a roll call or otherwise to defer further action until February 17 that is a decision for Congress. When Congress makes that decision I will stand on it regardless of the political consequences. There are some things I do not propose to do now or later, and that is to die a political death every time I have to vote on a roll call. I am just not so constituted and I do not lose any sleep over those things.

You can take that for what it is worth. Yesterday I questioned the extension to February 5, because of what Mr. Jones said, as the Record will show. I will give the other man credit for having just as much interest in the 1944 food program as I have, so we will leave that as it is.

Now here is another proposition. I was informed by the leader of the other body this morning that the Commodity Credit Corporation and the administration had agreed not to initiate any new

subsidy program until Congress acts on this proposition. That covers the five-way split that I mentioned when I first began to talk. I signed the conference report.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman not think when Congress is supporting the administration program to control inflation and provide food for the country, as long as Congress has made the commitment and gone on record in support of this program we ought to continue through and support the administration in what they have undertaken?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I cannot agree with the gentleman on that, because I am not supporting the administration in its subsidy inflation prevention program. I have voted against it before and I shall vote against it, as the gentleman from Texas said, if I am the only one, on a roll call, because I do not intend to vote for the subsidy program as a means of preventing inflation. The subsidy program as proposed will not prevent inflation. I signed the conference report to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation to February 17. That is what the conference report deals with. Between now and that date and at the earliest moment possible the Congress and the President should deal with this question in full and give the country the answer.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 134, noes 66.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-eight Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER [after counting]. Thirty-two Members have arisen; not a sufficient number.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes following the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONTROLLING THE SALE OF SURPLUS WAR MATERIALS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record at this point and to include therein a copy of a bill being introduced today at the request of the House Small Business Committee, on

controlling the sale of surplus war materials.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous approval of the House Small Business Committee, today I am introducing a bill designed to control the sale of surplus war materials by the Government. The Select Committee on Small Business of the House is composed of the following Members: **ROBINSON** of Utah, **KEOGH** of New York, **JACKSON** of Washington, **KEFAUVER** of Florida, **HALLECK** of Indiana, **LEONARD W. HALL** of New York, **PLOESER** of Missouri, **STEVENSON** of Wisconsin, and myself, chairman.

This measure deals with one of the foremost problems now confronting the Nation. Surplus materials already are being disposed of by the Government, and it is estimated that the total value of such goods to be sold after peace will be approximately \$75,000,000,000. At present, goods are being sold by junior executives located in more than 100 field offices of the different branches of the Government. This is being done without any general policy and chiefly by authority of an Executive order. Doubt exists in many quarters as to the legality of these sales, but there is general agreement that Congress has an immediate duty to legislate an over-all sales program into law.

The House Small Business Committee bill is simple in its provisions and will, your committee believes, deal adequately with the situation without creating any extensive new bureaus or involving any great cost. Primarily, it would make use of existing Government personnel widely experienced in business and finance, aided by advisory committees from retail business groups.

The chief aims of the bill are to obtain the greatest possible return for the taxpayer from the sale of goods, to assist in providing employment for returning members of the armed forces and others, to secure an even flow of goods to those places which need them most, and to help reestablish retail businesses which are now suffering from a lack of goods. The bill seeks to discourage speculation in surplus goods and to prevent the indiscriminate dumping of Government property at junk prices.

Principal provisions of the measure are as follows:

A central committee composed of the chairman of the board of directors of the Defense Supplies Corporation, as chairman, and the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Treasury and three experienced businessmen to be chosen by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall assemble and declare for sale all Government-owned surplus goods.

An immediate inventory shall be made of all surplus goods, which shall be kept up to date through frequent revisions.

Actual sales of material shall be made under the direction of R. F. C., acting in cooperation with advisory committees chosen from the retail groups represented by the surplus goods in question

in each instance. R. F. C. will be charged with responsibility for getting fair prices for goods and shall see to it that they are properly distributed so as to meet the needs of consumers. Goods are not to fall into the hands of speculators, but are to be sold so as to help provide employment and to aid retail business in getting back on its feet. In outlining a general program for R. F. C. to follow, however, the measure does not bind the bureau with too many inflexible provisions. It is the thought of this committee that R. F. C., in cooperation with these business advisory committees with plenty of latitude for action and a sincere desire to solve the problem, can do the job effectively.

A primary reason for selecting R. F. C. as the selling agency is that it already is charged with responsibility for disposing of industrial plants in which the Government has investments. Thus, this measure would bring all war materials investments of the Government under one management.

The only new positions sought to be created by this bill are memberships on the central and advisory committees. They would carry only nominal per diem compensations.

In general, this bill meets the outstanding wishes of all groups in and out of government who have been seeking surplus war goods legislation. On the question of need for a central operating agency all are agreed. Secretary of Commerce Jones, Under Secretary Forrestal, Admiral Land, and Under Secretary Patterson, who will be responsible for the sale of a vast quantity of Army goods, have all endorsed such an agency in testifying before two congressional committees. All business groups who have expressed an opinion to this committee are for such an agency. Likewise there is universal agreement that a sales agency experienced in selling and distributing goods should be set up.

This requirement seems to be adequately met by R. F. C. That retail businessmen should be asked to contribute their best advice and counsel is recognized by all. Hence the provision for the advisory committees.

Approximately a dozen governmental groups today are endeavoring to find solutions of the surplus war-goods situation.

Director Byrnes, Bernard M. Baruch, the Bureau of the Budget, the Procurement Division of the Treasury, O. P. A., O. D. T., and certain branches of the Army and the Navy are all concerned about the situation and trying to contribute something to its solution.

A variety of sales plans are being offered. The Navy is selling its surplus directly to bidders. The Army is selling some goods direct and others are being turned over to Treasury Procurement. Officials of Treasury Procurement are having a hard time trying to evolve a satisfactory sales plan. For instance, they are getting trucks and cars for sale from the Army, but they have not yet arrived at a definite selling plan for these items. Some officials want to sell direct

to the public. Dealers, who are virtually without trucks, are eager to buy the surplus, but first they are told they will not be permitted to bid on them and, later are told that they will have to compete against individual bidders. At first, O. D. T. planned on setting up a truck rationing plan, then this was abandoned. Today, no one apparently knows exactly just how these trucks and cars will be sold. Similar situations exist in other lines.

The most amazing thing that has come out of direct Army selling is the beautiful catalog mailed broadcast from the Memphis branch of the Air Service. A 32-page catalog, resplendent in a 3-color cover, this piece of advertising literature would compare favorably with the mailing pieces of any large mail-order house. Recipients were advised that a tremendous volume of surplus goods were on hand and more were to come. Many items described were of such a rare nature that dealers have not been able to buy them in months. Yet when dealers ordered them they invariably got back mimeographed letters saying, "Sorry, the goods are gone." These things are disturbing to industry and not the way in which our agencies can build public confidence in their actions.

This surplus-property situation is a job for Congress to clean up. The cold fact is that in delaying further action on it, we are not doing our duty toward the Nation. Half a dozen different congressional committees have been wrestling with various phases of it. We must get together on one measure which will be fair to all. That is the kind of bill your Small Business Committee has tried to prepare and has authorized me to submit to the Congress at this time. Your early consideration of this measure is earnestly requested.

A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act by adding a new title thereto relating to the sale or other disposition of surplus property of the United States

[Referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.]

Be it enacted, etc., That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is amended by inserting Title I, immediately before the first section thereof, by striking out the word "act" wherever it appears therein as a reference to such act (except in the short title of such act), and inserting in lieu thereof the word "title", and by adding at the end of such act, as amended, the following new title:

"TITLE II

"SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 201. This title may be cited as the 'Surplus Property Act of 1943.'

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 202. As used in this title—

"(1) The term 'property' means any supplies, materials, or equipment including real estate and improvements thereon, or tangible property owned by the United States, or by any corporation owned or controlled by the United States, which is under the jurisdiction or control of any governmental agency.

"(2) The term 'surplus property' means any property which has been declared to the central agency handling surplus property to be surplus to the function, activity, or project

in connection with which it was acquired or accrued.

"(3) The term 'government agency' means any executive department of the Government or any administrative units or subdivision thereof, any independent agency in the executive branch of the Government, and any corporation owned or controlled by the United States.

"SURPLUS PROPERTY POLICY BOARD

"Sec. 203. (a) There is hereby established a Surplus Property Board (referred to in this title as 'the Board'), which shall consist of the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Defense Supplies Corporation who shall be the Chairman thereof, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury, and three individuals to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The three individuals so appointed shall be businessmen who have had at least 5 years' experience in the business of the retail sale and distribution of merchandise.

"(b) The Board (1) shall determine and prescribe the methods to be used by governmental agencies in making and maintaining inventories of property, and (2) shall determine the surplus property under the jurisdiction of the various governmental agencies that should be sold or leased, and shall inform the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as to every such determination.

"DUTIES OF GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

"Sec. 204. Every governmental agency (1) shall make and maintain accurate uniform inventories, in accordance with methods determined and prescribed by the Board, of property under its jurisdiction, (2) shall cooperate with the Board for purposes of determining which of the property under its jurisdiction is surplus property, and (3) shall cooperate with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in connection with the sale or lease of surplus property pursuant to the provisions of this title.

"DUTIES OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

"Sec. 205. (a) Surplus property which the Board has determined should be sold or leased shall be sold or leased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in a manner consistent with the provisions of this section.

"(b) The Corporation shall appoint an advisory committee for each class of property which is to be sold or leased. The members of such advisory committee shall be appointed from among persons who, by reason of their business experience, are familiar with the handling and marketing of such class of property, or similar property. It shall be the duty of the Corporation, in selling or leasing surplus property, to consult with the appropriate advisory committee or committees so appointed as to the price, time, method, and manner of disposing of such property.

"(c) In the sale or lease of surplus property pursuant to this title, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall, so far as practicable, be governed by the following considerations:

"(1) Distribution of such property should be through established trade channels.

"(2) The acquisition of large quantities of such property for speculative purposes should not be permitted.

"(3) The prices at which any particular property or class of property is sold or leased should be uniform.

"(4) Such property should be sold or leased at prices low enough to facilitate the disposition thereof, but high enough to enable the United States to secure a fair return therefor.

"(5) The sale or lease of such property should be at a rate which will not unduly disrupt trade and commerce.

"(6) The sale or lease of such property should take into consideration the need for facilitating and encouraging the establishment in the various communities in the several States by members of the armed forces of the United States upon their discharge or release from active duty, as well as by others, of small business enterprises and with a view to strengthening small business enterprises.

"(d) The sale or lease of surplus property shall be in accordance with such regulations as the Board shall prescribe regarding the times, places, quantities, and terms and conditions of the proposed disposition of such property; and such regulations shall require advertising for competitive bids except in such cases and with respect to such property as the Board determines that sales or leases by competitive bids would be contrary to the public interest.

"EXCLUSIVE METHOD OF DISPOSING OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

"Sec. 206. No surplus property shall be sold, leased, or disposed of otherwise than in accordance with the provisions of this title, except that where provisions of law are in force specifically authorizing the sale or other disposition of any particular property or class of property, such property or class of property may be sold or otherwise disposed of in accordance with such provisions of law if the Board approves such action as being consistent with the public interest.

"TRANSFERS BETWEEN GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

"Sec. 207. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, governmental agencies shall make the fullest practicable utilization of surplus property in order to avoid waste and unnecessary expense, and for such purposes surplus property may be transferred from one governmental agency to another, in lieu of its sale or lease pursuant to the provisions of this title. Such transfers shall be made subject to such regulations as the Board shall prescribe.

"DISPOSITION OF NONSALABLE PROPERTY

"Sec. 208. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, surplus property which is not salable, or which for any other reason it is impracticable to transfer, sell, or lease as provided in this title, shall be repaired, rehabilitated, donated, destroyed, or disposed of in accordance with such regulations as the Board shall prescribe.

"PROCEEDS FROM SALE OR LEASE OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

"Sec. 209. All proceeds from the sale or lease of surplus property under this title shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"MISCELLANEOUS

"Sec. 210. (a) The Board is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation, subject to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, of such employees as may be necessary for the performance by the Board of its functions under this title.

"(b) Each member of the Board appointed thereto by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and each member of any advisory committee appointed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under this title, shall be paid compensation at the rate of \$----- per diem when actually engaged in the performance of his duties under this title, and shall be allowed necessary traveling expenses and subsistence expenses (not in excess of \$----- per day) incurred when absent from his place of residence in connection with the performance of such duties."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking Republican member of the House Small Business Committee, I desire to add my approval to the bill to regulate the sale of surplus war materials which Chairman PATMAN has introduced today.

This measure is the mature product of careful investigation and consideration. It is not a half-baked, suddenly inspired, half-coverage product. Your Small Business Committee has gone to the very roots of this problem, and it has, I feel convinced, prepared a measure which will be helpful to all taxpayers, the buying public, returning members of the armed forces, and particularly small businessmen and their employees.

The feature which pleases me most with this measure is its simplicity and clarity. It is a short bill of only a few hundred words. Any businessman can understand it; it does not require one versed in law and legislation to know what it is about.

Primarily it would set up a central agency to collect the goods. The R. F. C., an established Government agency, would be given the task of selling and distributing the goods. Advisory groups of businessmen would aid in the dissemination of the goods. Thus the Government and taxpayers will be assured of getting fair prices for goods on which billions of dollars have been spent, the public will be assured of an opportunity to buy these goods at fair prices and small retailers will be able to fill their now vacant shelves and meet their running costs while they are waiting for factories to get into production.

One thing which appeals to me about this bill is that under its provisions Congress does not try to set up a lot of complicated rules under which the agencies shall operate. It simply lays down general principles and then trusts to the judgment of those administering the measure to do a fair and decent job.

Speculators in war surplus goods and others who want to take advantage of taxpayers by getting materials at less than their fair values are not going to like this bill. Such persons had a field day in the sale of surplus goods following the last war. They bought at a few cents on the dollar and sold at top prices. This must not happen again, and I do not believe it will happen if this measure is enacted into law.

There is need for speedy action on this bill. Surplus war goods already are being dumped in a shameless manner. The sales scandals which have come to light so far have not been pleasant reading, and my first-hand knowledge of the situation tells me that if Congress does not legislate soon, worse scandals are coming. The only other alternatives to legislation are a continuation of the divided, haphazard methods of selling by various Government departments which now are being followed, or selling under the highly unsatisfactory Executive order plan. This country wants no part

of either. The duty of Congress is clear. That is to pass this bill soon. I hope it is done by the united efforts of Members of all parties just as this bill has been jointly approved in the Small Business Committee.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes at the conclusion of other special orders today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a national broadcast made by myself on the reasons for a simplified monetary system.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the conference report on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2562. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey to The State Hospital at Goldsboro, Goldsboro, N. C., a certain tract of land, situated in Wayne County, N. C.; and

H. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution extending until January 31, 1944, the provisions of the act of April 29, 1943, making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3598. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3611. An act to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

ABSENTEE SOLDIERS' VOTE

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, apparently everyone agrees that the soldiers should vote. But for the past several weeks the air has been filled with charges and countercharges of insincerity, unconstitutionality, vote steals, threatened secession, and a thousand and one other things which have done no one any good whatever. The only groups hurt by these heated arguments have been the members of the armed forces and the great rank and file of this Nation's people.

Never have I heard as many misleading statements and as much false propaganda directed at any legislation as has been done in the case of the Green-Lucas bill in the Senate and my bill in the House.

I have never believed that the Green-Lucas bill or my proposal was perfect. Indeed, it is seldom Congress passes a bill which is perfect. I have continually asked for suggestions which would better my bill and have received sound and constructive points from both Republicans and Democrats, members of the armed forces, and private citizens. I gratefully acknowledge these suggestions and have attempted to incorporate them in a bill which I have introduced today.

So that the people of the Nation might have a better idea as to the necessity for any new legislation at all, let me give a brief résumé of the present circumstances. All but 2 of the 48 States provide an absentee voting method. Unfortunately, however, the great majority of these voting procedures were modeled for peacetime and not for wartime.

All the members of the armed forces are primarily civilians. They laid down the plow and pen. They left their desks, homes, farms, factories, and businesses to answer the call to arms. They are civilians primarily and are accustomed to exercising the greatest democratic privilege of the greatest democratic country—the privilege to vote.

Now, it is impossible for any State in the Union to keep track of its citizen soldiers because they have lost their identity as citizens of a given State and have become units in a fighting machine which functions as a nation.

Let me say with pride that many of the States have made diligent efforts to provide a vote for their men. Even in those States which have tried hard to overcome the problems which war has brought about, their efforts have been unsuccessful. It is not their fault. They simply do not possess the necessary machinery nor can they revise their laws to overcome the tremendous physical difficulties of absentee voting. Let me illustrate this. Many States require that an application for absentee ballot be made on an official application blank. The soldier writes to his secretary of state. The secretary of state returns the official application for a ballot. The soldier fills out the application which is returned to the secretary of state. The

secretary of state then sends him the ballot. The soldier marks the ballot and returns it to the secretary of state. Here are five separate and distinct transactions and each step consumes many days.

The average time in which an absentee vote can be cast is limited to 30 days. Obviously, even with air-mail facilities, these five steps cannot be completed within that time even by many of the men stationed within the continental limits of the United States. And to say that those 5,000,000 stationed abroad could secure a ballot in this fashion would be stating the impossible. Further, during the process of any one of these steps the man himself might be removed from his original point of application.

Some States, however, do not require an official application blank and in such States only three steps will be involved. The soldier requests an absentee ballot; in numerous States the secretary cannot, however, send out an absentee ballot until a certain number of days before the election. Then the soldier returns the ballot and hopes it reaches the proper election official in time to be counted. Even the three steps mentioned have proved largely ineffective because of the red tape involved. Further, it has been reliably estimated that even with air-mail facilities, from 2 to 4 months would be required for a soldier in Australia and other points in the southwest Pacific to vote under the average State absentee voting law. The same is true of those forces stationed in north Africa, Italy, Great Britain, and other points scattered over the globe. The best proof of the ineffectiveness of the present system is that in the general election held last year only 28,000 out of a possible 7,000,000 votes were cast and counted. This means only 1 soldier out of every 250 voted.

At the time of the general election in 1944, which will probably mark the most important Presidential election in our history, we will have about 11,000,000 men and women in the armed forces of this Nation. This means about one-fourth of the total electorate of this Nation will not be in a position, under present laws, to be heard in the selection of officials who will shape the policies and destinies of the Nation for the next 4 years. Under the present inadequate machinery their voices are effectively stifled. If they do not vote, then the election will be an empty one. It will not be a representative vote of the people and by the people and for the people.

Let us first see what Congress has done. Last year the Congress enacted Public Law 712. This law provides that a member of the armed forces, if otherwise eligible according to the law of his State, may vote for Federal officials without registering or paying a poll tax in that State. These are the two points which have given rise to constitutional questions. I would be the last man in the House to question the sincerity of anyone who raised the constitutionality of these two points. Many eminent

lawyers, jurists, and statesmen find themselves in disagreement on these two questions, and I do not feel personally competent to shed any additional light at this time on either point.

Apparently Congress resolved this constitutional doubt in favor of the man bearing the truly terrific hardships of war. Presumably every Member of Congress was faithful to his oath of office, because those who believed in its constitutionality supported Public Law 712. Those who doubted its constitutionality voted against it. This law which was adopted by top-heavy majorities in both the House and Senate has been the law of the land for well over a year, but no one has questioned its constitutionality in the courts. Since there have been 28,000 instances which presumably could have been taken into the courts, I must conclude that the people of this Nation are willing to subscribe to the wisdom of this action.

Throughout the months and months of study, hearings, and debate I have tried hard to arrive at a formula which would provide an effective means for 11,000,000 members of our armed forces to exercise the right of suffrage. I have not had in mind a bill which would elect Democrats or Republicans or candidates of any particular party. I have not had in mind any desire or intention to permit the Federal Government to control or attempt to control State elections. Congress has certain powers—the States have certain powers. My purpose has been to find a way within legal and constitutional grounds to overcome the mechanical difficulties which beset us and to eliminate the void which has effectively prevented soldier voting.

There must be a way. There is a way. I believe that the proposal which I have introduced today will be acceptable to those who are sincere in their desire to help the soldiers vote.

Let me give a brief résumé of the provisions of my bill. In the first place, it creates an agency known as the War Ballot Commission. The President appoints, subject to Senate confirmation, the membership thereof from a list of six names submitted to him by the chairman of the Republican Party and by the chairman of the Democratic Party, respectively.

The purpose of the Commission is to secure information from the several States as to the identity of its nominees for Federal office, to relay that information to the Army and Navy, and to print the Federal ballot. It keeps a record of the ballots printed and returned, the number forwarded to the various States and is required to report on these matters to Congress. And I might say the only purpose of the Commission is to relieve the War and Navy Departments of heavy administrative duties.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WORLEY. The Commission has no powers to investigate alleged irregu-

larities. It has no power to act except in a purely administrative capacity. If it has other powers, then it is because I have been unable to find the necessary language to restrict it and I welcome any suggestions.

As an additional safeguard I provide that a majority of all the Commission shall be necessary to a decision by the Commission on any matter.

The bill provides that only members of the armed forces of the United States shall be eligible to vote thereunder. Much sound argument has been made for including members of the Red Cross, members of the merchant marine and others who are not literally or actually members of the armed forces but many of whom are exposed to the same deadly dangers of war as the soldiers themselves. It might even be argued that those migratory laborers that moved from one State to the war plants of another should be included. Does Congress possess such power? Suffice it to say that at the present time my proposal includes only those who are members of the armed forces.

An official Federal war ballot is provided. This ballot contains spaces whereby the soldier can vote either for the name of his choice for President, Vice President, United States Senator, and United States Representatives in Congress, or he may vote for the party of that candidate. Democrat, Republican, Progressive, Farmer-Labor, and other parties are mentioned on the ballot.

The voter is provided with this uniform ballot. He takes the oath of an elector which shows that he is a citizen of the United States, that he is of certain age, his home State, county, city, town, or village, street number and/or rural route, and how long he had lived there before induction. He votes this ballot in a secret place, seals his envelope, which is placed within an outer envelope for transmission directly to the War Ballot Commission. Immediately upon receipt by the Commission the ballot is forwarded to the State of the voter's residence. Once it reaches the voter's State it is transmitted to the local election official of the precinct in which the voter resides. Please bear in mind that no official is permitted to open or in any way tamper with any ballot until it reaches the local precinct election official. It will not be necessary under this procedure for the secrecy of the ballot to be violated by censorship. As all of us know, State ballots today are subject to censorship for obvious reasons.

Priorities, including free air mail, on the transmission of Federal war ballots and other communications under title I are provided insofar as they will not conflict with the effective prosecution of the war.

Now we come to the point of who is to determine the validity of the ballots actually cast. As pointed out, the present statute, Public Law 712, eliminates the necessity of registration or poll-tax payment by members of the armed forces for the privilege of voting for Federal officials. With these questions my bill does not deal. It provides, however, by the clearest and most specific language in

my power that with the exception of these two points the duly constituted election officials of the States themselves shall have the power to determine the validity of all ballots cast. It is further provided that such ballots shall be canvassed, counted, and certified by its proper canvassing boards in accordance with the laws of such State in the same manner as ballots cast within its borders are canvassed, counted, and certified. An additional safeguard is the following language:

The War Ballot Commission shall have no powers or functions with respect to the determination of the validity of ballots cast under the provisions of this title.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WORLEY. All of this means, of course, that, with the exceptions pointed out, if a State wishes to recognize the ballot prescribed herein, it may do so. If it does not wish to recognize the ballots cast by its soldier citizens it will not do so. It would seem therefore that anyone who argues the question of States' rights has an empty and meaningless argument.

All voting safeguards are provided for. My bill says that the provisions of State and Federal laws prohibiting offenses against the elective franchises shall apply.

These are the major points of title I of my proposal. Title II facilitates voting under State law for State as well as Federal officials. If the soldier is willing to take a chance in attempting to comply with the complex provisions of his State law then he may follow that procedure. In an effort to assist those who desire a State ballot we have provided for air mail free of postage. Personally, I hope that as many of the soldiers as possible will take advantage of the State procedures.

Now so far as the question of propaganda, political speeches, dissemination of biased or prejudiced information, let me say I have also provided for that. I have adopted virtually intact the amendment offered by Senator TAFT in the Senate. The effect of this amendment is to provide equal time and facilities for any candidate for Federal office. It is a rather involved and complex problem but I believe we have found an effective solution. This will give all sides an equal opportunity to reach the soldiers both here and abroad.

As I stated in the beginning, my purpose is not to elect Democrats or Republicans. My purpose is simply to go as far as we can go in trying to restore to the soldier one of the most precious rights he had in peacetime. When we put him in uniform we took away many rights and privileges of both the Federal and State constitutions. When we make it possible for him to vote we still have not restored many of the privileges taken from him, but we have at least done our best to say to him, "While you fight for this democracy you will also have an opportunity to vote for this democracy."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend the gentleman from Texas, who has the distinction of serving several months as a naval officer in the present war, not only for his introduction of this measure which if enacted into law will make certain that all qualified men and women in the armed forces of the United States will have an opportunity to vote, but also for this informative address he has delivered here today. May I add that I would go still further. I am strongly of the opinion that every man and woman in the uniform of the United States should be, irrespective of age, given the opportunity to vote. Surely anyone who is willing to lay down his life if need be for freedom's cause should be given the right to vote. I hold that anyone who is old enough to fight for his country is sufficiently matured to cast a vote for any candidate from President to constable.

Mr. WORLEY. I appreciate very much the comments the gentleman has made.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield.

Mr. ROLPH. I also want to compliment the gentleman on his very able address.

Mr. WORLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROLPH. I should like to have him explain to the House how his plan would operate as far as primary elections are concerned.

Mr. WORLEY. No one is more interested in primary elections than the people of Texas and the Southern States. They are very important elections, but we have been advised by officials of the Army and Navy that it would be physically impossible to transport ballots all over the world for the boys to vote in the primaries in all the States. It is not a matter of desire, it is a question of how far we can go to provide some form of ballot.

Under title II they can vote the State ballot for candidates in the primaries; however title I applies only to the general election of Federal officials.

Mr. ROLPH. Under title II they may vote in the primaries?

Mr. WORLEY. Under title II, yes; and we provide free air-mail service for those who would like to vote in the primaries in their States.

Mr. ROLPH. I wish to emphasize that so far as California is concerned—and I presume it is likewise in the other States—the primaries are very important.

Mr. WORLEY. They are in Texas.

Mr. ROLPH. I hope provision will be made if possible for the men in the service to vote in the primaries.

Mr. WORLEY. Provision is made in title II.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from Texas be allowed to proceed for 10 additional minutes. This is an important subject; a

number of Members want to ask questions and this is probably the closing day of the session. I think he should have 10 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that the resolution for adjournment is coming back in 20 minutes. This would not leave any time for the opposition to be heard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for 10 additional minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to proceed with my special order. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two particulars, in one to include excerpts from an address by Mr. Blandford, and in the other to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of Chairman SHEPPARD, who is ill, and on behalf of the Naval Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I wish to make a statement to the House respecting currently available naval appropriations. I shall endeavor to be brief.

The naval budget for the current fiscal year was not presented by the President until April 3, 1943. It was presented late because in war it is not possible to project a long-range fiscal program, and the estimates were held back in order that they would represent the last-minute judgment of those conducting our Naval Establishment.

The course of war continually brings about new situations, changed conditions, and these affect in varying ways and degrees the funds the Congress provides. They might result in larger demands in some directions and lesser demands in others. The net might be either "red" or "black." In the case of the Army, as has been reported, it appears that there will be a very substantial amount in the "black."

Premised upon such considerations, following the close of the first quarter of the current fiscal year, namely, September 30, 1943, I communicated to the Secretary of the Navy that my Naval Subcommittee desired a restudy made of currently available funds as a prelude to a hearing to determine the Navy's latest financial status.

That restudy has been made and the committee followed it with an examination of the Secretary of the Navy, Vice Admiral Horne, who is Vice Chief of Naval Operations, the Budget Office of the Navy Department, Admiral Allen, and the heads of the several bureaus and

offices of the Navy Department, including the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard, the examination extending over several days.

Its investigation has netted some substantial savings. On the other hand, it has disclosed that in all probability it will be necessary before the close of the fiscal year to provide some additional funds. The net result at this time indicates a deficiency in the neighborhood of \$700,000,000.

The Navy commenced the current fiscal year with a total obligational availability of \$31,109,623,798. Two billion dollars of that sum consisted of contractual authority—aviation—and \$1,472,397,600 was made up of unobligated prior-year appropriations—mainly for new ship construction.

Of the total of \$31,000,000,000 plus, estimated savings, according to the committee's investigation, aggregate \$1,229,308,699, and presently estimated deficiencies aggregate \$1,930,492,112, or a net deficiency, as I previously have indicated, of about \$700,000,000.

By far the larger portion of the savings has been previously reported. They occur under the head of "Ordnance and ordnance stores," and aggregate \$1,171,378,404. The amount flows from many projects under such appropriation and is traceable primarily to reduced costs due to quantity production, and to consumption running less than the actual requirements of current operations.

It will be recalled that \$750,000,000 of this ordnance saving is used in the pending deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 3598) to increase the capital of the "Naval stock fund," instead of providing an additional appropriation for such purpose. That, of course, is an actual direct saving of three-quarters of a billion dollars.

The remainder of the ordnance saving—\$421,378,404, has been placed in reserve by the Bureau of the Budget, and let me say that it is just about as difficult to get funds so reserved released as it is to get an appropriation through the Congress.

Apart from ordnance, all but a relatively negligible amount of currently available funds, which it now appears will not be needed for the purposes for which provided, is Coast Guard money. Admiral Waesche reported to us that present indications are that his activity will be able to get along with \$29,267,802—net—less than he first anticipated. There are two principal reasons: First, the Coast Guard has been able to enroll temporary reserves without compensation; and second, it has been able to augment its submarine-patrol service by utilizing privately owned craft without purchase.

On the other side of the ledger, Mr. Speaker, we found that before the fiscal year closer we probably shall be confronted with supplemental requests totaling somewhere around \$1,930,000,000. Primarily, that is because the operating force plan of ships and personnel upon which the appropriations previously made were based has been quite considerably expanded. The building program has been accelerated to fit into revised

operating plans, and that means a larger outlay upon vessel construction, for more ships completed, for more men, and for more operating expenses. It is expected that there will be an increase of 608 operating units, and an increase of 173,500 enlisted personnel, Navy, and 80,860 enlisted personnel, Marine Corps. There will be some relatively small additional amounts necessary, besides, all because of the fact that the Navy has not yet levelled off, and I wish to stress that fact, Mr. Speaker.

The Navy's job in the Atlantic and in the European and Mediterranean areas continues to be a large one, and the future, particularly the immediate future, will make heavier demands upon it in such areas than at any previous time since the beginning of the war.

In the Pacific, I need not tell you that the war has only begun. No navy in all history has even been confronted with a larger task. The offensive has begun and will be prosecuted vigorously, and I am sure not a Member of the Congress will hesitate a moment to give the Navy full support in every way sought by our naval leadership.

The net result of our inquiry, Mr. Speaker, is a saving of roundly \$1,230,000,000. That money will not be needed for the purposes for which appropriated. Seven hundred and fifty million dollars of that amount already has been reapropriated by the Congress to another use, and the remainder, so far as we now can tell, will revert to the Treasury.

I am glad to report to the House that the Department, in our judgment, is endeavoring to function as economically as war conditions permit, and is cooperating with the committee in holding costs to minimum levels.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. HOLIFIELD and Mr. PLUMLEY asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

(Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to speak for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. KING]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was just told that the other body has passed a resolution to adjourn from next Tuesday until the 10th of January. I suppose that is good news to some, but in my judgment we should stay in session until we have passed the legislation giving mustering-out pay, the legislation necessary to enable the servicemen to vote, and any legislation that may be required to prevent or end any strikes which may occur.

Once upon a time, long, long ago, there was a great Democratic Party with principles. Then the New Deal came along and something happened to that party. New dealers took over. Since they have taken over it has become—may I say—the custom to shove the Constitution a little further back in order to pass legislation which the New Deal seemed to want. Over in the other body a few days ago—I did not hear this, I read it in the RECORD—one of the Members, and he was a Republican, said in effect that the Constitution did not amount to so much in time of war, we might just disregard it. He was speaking on this bill to permit soldiers to vote. My own judgment is—I do not know much about it, it is just a guess—that these men who are doing the fighting, and the women, too, are more interested in their job of getting the war over than they are in voting. At least that has been the indication when in other wars they have had the chance to vote, except possibly the Civil War in the last election which occurred while that war was on.

None of us wants to deprive anyone who is in the armed services of the right to vote. As I get the proposition it is just a difference of opinion as to how that should be accomplished. That is all there is to it. There is one school of thought advanced by those who want to take a short cut, right straight across the Constitution, or, rather, disregard it entirely. While it is true, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] said on the floor of the House last night, the Congress has the power and the authority to determine when, where, and the time of election. The determination of the qualifications of the electors is left entirely to the States. That is the constitutional provision. If we want to adopt the proposition and adhere to it, that we are going to shove the Constitution aside, throw it into the ashcan, while the war is on, then all right, if that is the will of the Congress. But that I do not believe we have any right to do. But if we do that we ought to go into the thing with our eyes open.

I recall sometime ago on the floor here the gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS], asked me to yield and I did. I put to him the question, after some discussion, whether or not he thought we could carry on a war under the terms of the Constitution, and he said, "No; we could not." That was the substance of his answer. I do not subscribe to that doctrine at all. It is my firm conviction that the people of America adhering to the principles of the Constitution will voluntarily do more than any Federal Government or State government can

force them to do. It may be unfortunate, but there is in every one of us a disposition not to be pushed around, so we who believe that the soldiers should be given the opportunity to vote want the soldiers to vote and we want them to vote their convictions. We do not want them to have their judgment, their opinion, influenced by any Federal commission.

It is a matter of record from committee reports submitted at the other end of the Capitol that money which we appropriated back in 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, along in there, money which was appropriated by this Congress for the relief of the unfortunate, was used to influence elections. That report was not made by Republicans. That report was made by members of the majority party, so we can accept it at its face value. It was charged on the floor of the other body that under the terms of the Lucas-Green bill the election could be stolen. If there is in power, as there is, a party that has used money appropriated for, let us say, charitable purposes, appropriated to aid the unfortunate, the hungry, the ill-clad, and ill-housed, with that kind of a party in power, that desires to give the soldiers, the service men and women, an opportunity to vote, I say who wants to entrust the election machinery to an organization of that kind?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. For a question.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The majority of the States of the Union are governed by Republican Governors. Under the bill just introduced by the gentleman from Texas, the counting of ballots will be in the hands of those Republican administrations in those States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Those that get back will be counted, but they will be marked under the supervision of a Federal agency. They will be cast and counted under State laws, not under any Governor. You have your elections up in Pennsylvania, and your politicians up there have charged each other with fraud and corruption. We do not have any of that in Michigan.

The supporters of the Green-Lucas bill do not want to leave this to the States where the Constitution places it. Oh, no. They want to put it in the hands of some of these bureaucrats, let them take the ballots over, let them submit the ballots under conditions which they create, let them be marked under situations which they make, or as the issues are painted by Federal officials, then have the ballots brought back by this Federal commission—bring them back 3,000 miles. What is going to happen to them on the way back? Who knows? The ballots all the time in charge of a Federal commission appointed by and acting under the Commander in Chief who is himself a candidate—none of that for me. Listen to some of the Kentucky election frauds. Get the gentleman from Kentucky, or from Tennessee rather, to tell you some day about how the Democratic Party carries on an election down there and what they do with the ballots before and after the election boards get them. A party that will take money, mind you, appropriated to buy food and clothing,

a party that will do that, take it away from the unfortunate, I would not trust across a duck pond, to say nothing of letting them have this election 3,000 or 6,000 miles away. No. We want the service people, the men and women, the WAVES, the WAC's, the Marines, and all the rest of them to have a vote, but we do not propose to have somebody else vote them.

Mr. BURDICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. The gentleman said he thought we should carry on a war and at the same time operate under the provisions of the Federal Constitution.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

Mr. BURDICK. Does the gentleman maintain that in World War No. 1 we followed the Constitution?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know what we did in World War No. 1, but I never knew the Congress disregarded the Constitution during that war.

Mr. BURDICK. What about free speech in any war; is that not curtailed?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is always curtailed to a certain extent; that is, as to military information but not otherwise.

Mr. BURDICK. When we have war there are many provisions of the Federal Constitution that must necessarily be curtailed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not agree with the gentleman. I just disagree with that statement. The observance of constitutional provisions in no way interferes with the war effort.

It is a strange situation that free people cannot carry on the war under the fundamental law they have adopted and to which they adhere. Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]—last night, I think it was, I noticed it in the RECORD—said I was a "Rankin Republican." I do not know whether he meant the rest of the Republicans were rank Republicans and I was just a Rankin Republican or just what he did mean. I will say this, at least, if I am a Rankin Republican, at least there are two of us which is one more than the party, which the gentleman represents, has in Washington. I will say another thing, we have been talking a long time, some of us have, some people in this country, about a coalition. Now the parties are beginning to line up. It is no longer, as has been said here so often, Republican Democrats or Democrats against Republicans.

There has been a sort of New Deal, a New Deal Party which has taken over the Democratic Party, and perhaps there has been some disagreement on our side along certain lines. And so the situation has come to where today there are those who believe in adhering to the Constitution and then there are those who think that you can just scrap it or perhaps cut the corners here and there. Now if the time comes when I must make my choice, and I think it has, as between Democrats from the South, West, or the North, who believe in the old Constitution and in the customs and practices of America as we have known them for the last one-hundred-and-

sixty-odd years, if that day comes when I must make a choice to go along with those men or to join with that group of new dealers or bureaucrats and wild, woolly, and fuzzy-headed individuals or whatever you want to call them, professors, then I will not hesitate 1 minute, not 1 minute, I will go with the Democrats who believe in the Constitution, if I am forced to make a choice. And if I am forced to choose, as the gentleman seems to think I am, between the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], much as I hate to make the choice, great as my grief may be, weeping as I make that choice, I will go with the man from Tupelo, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I want to say that the gentleman is welcome to the company he has chosen.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And I will say to that gentleman that under the Constitution it is my privilege to make my choice.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Certainly, and you are welcome to your chosen leader.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am, and I am glad I do not need to hold my nose after making it.

Mr. McMURRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. McMURRAY. Does not the gentleman take into consideration it is also the privilege of these fighting men and women to vote? Does not the gentleman think our Constitution intended that people who fight and are willing to die for their country likewise should have the privilege to vote, and not any so-called phony privilege, not a sham privilege to vote, but a genuine privilege?

Mr. HOFFMAN. What are you doing; making a speech? Why do you not get a special order?

Mr. McMURRAY. I am asking the gentleman a question and I will ask him to answer yes or no.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, yes or no?

Well, when did you stop sucking eggs? Tell me that, yes or no. I have made it plain that I want the men and women in the service to have the privilege of voting; that I do not want someone to vote them. I do not want to argue with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY] because I recall when he stood down here in the Well of the House, on some tax bill I think he was talking, and how he told us how many years he had been a professor teaching taxation or economics or something over there in Wisconsin. I recall very distinctly at that time he told us of his qualifications to pass on every conceivable subject that might come before the House. Certainly after that testimonial which he gave to his own knowledge I am not so presumptuous as to enter into any debate with him on any question that he puts. I would not think of it. The gentleman is possessed of such great knowledge and ability and is so aware of it that I would not think of venturing an opinion when he has spoken.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think I can ask the gentleman a question that he can answer "yes" or "no."

Will the gentleman inform the House whether he favors the Rankin bill? That is easy to answer "yes" or "no," I submit, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, it is? If I must answer "yes" or "no," I will say, "Yes." I say yes. Is that plain enough?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am delighted to know the gentleman is in favor of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You might have known the answer without having to ask me. I have never been for any fraudulent scheme that would deprive anybody of the right to vote. Nor have I knowingly supported a measure which opened the door to fraud.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am glad to know that the gentleman from Michigan is following the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not following anyone. There are no rings in the noses of Republicans. I heard some of the debate in the Senate. I heard the Members of that body who adhere to the Democratic Party, some of them, tell what that bill was and the sort of steal it would permit and how it would enable a small group to control the elections. I cannot be for that. Up in our country we let them vote and we count the votes as they are cast.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY], chairman of the committee concerning a soldiers' voting bill that he proposes to introduce, and that we other members of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress have never seen.

What he should do would be to call the committee together and let us report out the bill that passed the Senate, with some minor amendments, and pass it through the House now, in order that every man in the armed forces may be able to vote in the coming election and have those votes counted.

Remember that this bill that passed the Senate meets the test of constitutionality. When you go to overriding the Constitution of the United States under the pretense that this is a war measure, when it is more or less a political measure, if not a political measure pure and simple, you are dangerously tampering with the Constitution, the greatest safeguard the American people ever had.

It took 2,000 years for mankind to build up to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. This Senate bill with our amendments would enable every serviceman to vote by absentee ballot, not only to vote for the Members of the Congress and the Senate, and President and Vice President, but it will go beyond that and enable him to vote for State, county, and other local officials. They are more interested in that than they are in voting

for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] or the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] or the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. It was stated a while ago by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] that it would take five transactions, if this bill passed, to get these ballots to the men and back. Nothing of the kind. Every Governor of every State in this Union is ready to co-operate, and some of them have already announced the calling of extra sessions of their legislatures for that purpose.

So if their laws do not meet the requirements, they can change them so they will meet them. What does our bill do? In the first place we ask the States to take the necessary steps to enable their men in the service to vote by absentee ballots. The next thing—and this is not any gesture, either—the next thing we do is to provide that the Army and Navy shall do everything possible to expedite getting these ballots to them and back.

But the gentleman from Texas a while ago, echoing the statement of Colonel Cutler, Boston lawyer, who seems to have assumed the attitude of a propagandist more than an adviser before the committee, said it would take from 2 to 4 months to get these ballots there and back. Why, Wendell Willkie went around the world in 49 days, and kissed the barmaids and fan dancers as he went.

Mr. WORLEY. And Mr. Willkie was looking for votes.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, sir; and is yet. If the Army and Navy does what we command them to do in this bill they will expedite getting these ballots to the servicemen. They will go directly from your home State through the mails to those boys in various parts of the world, and they will not need a Federal commission to meddle with them in the meantime.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. WORLEY. I do not like to take any of the gentleman's time, except to ask if I may ask him to yield for several questions as he goes along.

Mr. RANKIN. I will yield if I can get some extra time.

Another thing it does, it gives them free air-mail service, not only for the ballots, but for communications in connection therewith. It does not change the qualifications of the electors in your States. The bill that has been pending before our committee does. In doing so, it violates section 2 of article I of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that electors for Representatives in Congress shall have the same qualification as electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislature. You would wipe out that provision which had been in the Constitution 126 years when it was reenacted in the seventeenth amendment. Yet you would wipe that out. You would wipe them both out, if you please. You would wipe out that provision that leaves to the States the manner of electing their electors for the President of the United States. When you do that, this election will be null and void and you will have a contest in

the courts of practically every State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I am afraid I cannot present what I wish to present in a question, but you have raised one vital issue as to the qualifications of electors.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, that is right.

Mr. REED of New York. I wish you would enlarge as to just why that was left to the States.

Mr. RANKIN. Why, simply because if they had left the selection of electors to the Federal Government, the States might have disappeared, as some of the modern radicals would like to have them do now.

Mr. REED of New York. Would the gentleman mind my telling just why?

James Wilson, who sat on the Constitutional Convention, stated the reason. They wanted to assure the States that the Federal Government would not become so centralized in its power that it would impinge on the rights of the States and so, to bring about confidence in the States, they said, we are willing to take the same qualifications that you fix for the most numerous branch of your State legislatures.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

In other words, they said they wanted the States to do the electing and not concentrate all this power in the hands of the Federal Government. Let me tell you two things that have killed republics in the past. The first is centralization of power, and the other is the concentration of wealth. This is one of the most dangerous steps toward centralization of power in the Federal Government that I have ever seen proposed. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], and others, have talked about the men who take my position not wanting the soldiers to vote.

When did they become the only friends of the soldiers? Do you know that two of the United States Senators—Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, and Senator McCLELLAN, of Arkansas—who supported this bill wholeheartedly when it passed the Senate have already lost sons in this conflict? One of the other Senators who supported this bill has three sons in the war. Everyone in this House and everyone in the Senate has some loved one in this conflict. Do not forget that the people at home, the people back in your State, think more of their loved ones than anybody else on earth does, and they will see that these ballots are sent to them.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I contend, if the gentleman from Mississippi will permit, the machinery set up by your recommendation in the States is so cumbersome it will result in preventing many of the service people from voting.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes, I know some people think that State government is cumbersome. You have an element in this country that wants to get rid of State government. I am not so sure but

what the gentleman from Pennsylvania is gradually gravitating in that direction, or, I might say, rapidly gravitating in that direction.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Less than 1 percent of the men in the armed services voted.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not yield any further, Mr. Speaker.

I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] jumped on the white people of the South, and he went on to say how so few men voted by absentee ballots in that State last year. The facts are that we had nothing but a congressional election last year, and there was not a single candidate for Congress who had opposition. The only candidate we had for the Senate had no opposition. Therefore, they did not attempt to vote in the general election. In addition, every intelligent lawyer knew that that bill which we passed last year was unconstitutional, and they did not want to become involved in something that would vitiate the election.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I simply wanted to correct the gentleman. I did not jump on the people of the South. I was simply attempting to jump on the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from New York can read his own words. God forbid that the people of the South should ever need the leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. On the question of voting for electors, the gentleman made the statement that under the Lucas bill, by not permitting the soldiers to vote for electors, it nullified the Constitution. I want to call to the gentleman's attention to the fact that in my State of Michigan, we have already amended our election laws so that only candidates for President and Vice President appear, and the names of electors do not appear on the ballots. So we are not voting for electors.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further. The gentleman can deliver that lecture in Detroit. They may need it in Detroit and he may need to lecture there next year. Other States have made no such changes and Congress has no power to compel them to do so.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi, has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand there is some legislation on the Speaker's desk?

The SPEAKER. Not yet.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not like to object to the gentleman's proceeding further, but I hope he will finish within the 5 minutes, because there are

many people who want to vote on this legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. I will finish in 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. What we are trying to do is to make it possible for these men in our armed forces to vote in the local elections, as well as the national elections. What we are trying to do is to maintain the election machinery in the hands of the States. What we are trying to do is to maintain our American system, and that is what these boys want. What we are trying to do is to enable them to vote, in a legal, constitutional election, not only for Federal officers, but also for county, State, and local officers as well. Under our bill the names of all candidates would be printed on the ballot that goes to the soldier, and more soldiers would vote under it than would under the other bill, for the reason that they are more interested in local affairs than they are national affairs, especially when their relatives and friends, or they themselves, are running for local offices.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Does not the gentleman believe that the right of a citizen to vote in the primary election is as important as the right to vote in any general election?

Mr. RANKIN. I am not so sure about that, because in the general election he can vote against the primary nominees if he wants to.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Is there anything in either the bill as proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] or the bill that is proposed by the gentleman from Mississippi, that will assure to any citizen, who is in the armed services, the absolute right to vote in a primary election, except as that right is prescribed under the absentee voting laws of the various States today?

Mr. RANKIN. No.

Mr. KEEFE. So that under either one of these bills, the right to vote in a primary election is not assured, unless they can do it pursuant to the provisions of the absentee voting laws?

Mr. RANKIN. That is true.

Now, in conclusion let me say this: The people of the States are most interested in their servicemen from their particular community than anybody else in the world. They are ready and willing to make every possible provision and to see that these ballots are sent out.

Do you think I would be opposed to this measure, that I would be making this fight, if I did not think there was a great constitutional question involved, that probably involved the fate of our constitutional form of government?

Talk about your friendship for the veterans. Go back and search the record for 20 years. I have gone through every fight for the veterans of the last war every year here for the last 20 years. I

have helped override the veto of every President since I have been in Congress, in order to take care of our disabled veterans, their widows and orphans. Last year it was my amendment that raised the base pay of the soldiers to \$50 a month, and some of the very men who rushed into print to criticize me for my stand on this proposition voted against that amendment.

I am in favor of their voting; but I want to tell you now that if every man in the armed forces knew what was in these two bills, if they could have their choice, they would say, "Maintain our dual system of government. Maintain our States' rights. Maintain the election machinery in the hands of the States, and give us the right to vote for local offices, as well as for State and county offices, and print the names on the ballots so we will know whom we are voting for. See that we get to vote in a legal election."

I do not know what changes have been made in this last bill, but under the other one there was a provision for a fine of \$5,000 and 5 years' imprisonment or both, after prosecution in a Federal court, for any election holder anywhere in the country who was charged with violation of the Lucas-Worley bill. With that hanging over them, how would you get any men and women to help hold elections?

No, we are not going to usurp the States' election machinery in any such way. But I will go the limit to make provision for these men to vote a free ballot in a legal election and to get those ballots to them and back just as quick as possible. But we are not willing to violate the Constitution or usurp the election machinery of the States, or deny them the right to vote for candidates for local offices.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) entitled "Joint resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution providing for final adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress; and

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 174]

Allen, Ill.	Gale	Mruk
Anderson, Calif.	Gallagher	Murphy
Arnold	Gamble	Myers
Baldwin, Md.	Gathings	Newsome
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gavagan	Norton
Barden	Gavin	O'Brien, Ill.
Barry	Gerlach	O'Brien, N. Y.
Beall	Gordon	O'Leary
Bender	Gore	O'Toole
Bland	Grant, Ala.	Pfeifer
Boren	Grant, Ind.	Phillips
Boykin	Gregory	Phillips
Bradley, Mich.	Gross	Pracht
Bradley, Pa.	Gwynne	Randolph
Brooks	Hall	Reece, Tenn.
Brumbaugh	Leonard W.	Reed, Ill.
Buckley	Harris, Va.	Rees, Kans.
Bulwinkle	Hartley	Rizley
Burchill, N. Y.	Hébert	Rodgers, Pa.
Burgin	Heffernan	Russell
Busbey	Hess	Sabath
Byrne	Hill	Sasser
Camp	Holmes, Mass.	Satterfield
Canfield	Jackson	Scanlon
Cannon, Fla.	Jeffrey	Schiffler
Capozzoli	Jennings	Schuetz
Carrier	Johnson	Schwabe
Celler	J. Leroy	Scott
Chapman	Johnson	Shafer
Chipfield	Lyndon B.	Sheridan
Cox	Johnson, Ward	Sikes
Cullen	Jones	Simpson, Pa.
Curley	Kee	Slaughter
D'Alesandro	Kelley	Smith, Va.
Davis	Kennedy	Smith, W. Va.
Dawson	Keogh	Snyder
Delaney	Kilburn	Somers, N. Y.
Dickstein	Kleberg	Starnes, Ala.
Dies	Klein	Stevenson
Dillweg	Knutson	Sumner, Ill.
Dingell	Landis	Sumners, Tex.
Disney	Lane	Talbot
Domengeaux	Larcade	Tarver
Douglas	LeCompte	Taylor
Drewry	Lemke	Thomas, N. J.
Durham	Luce	Thomas, Tex.
Eaton	Lynch	Tibbott
Ellis	McCord	Towe
Elmer	McGehee	Treadway
Engle, Calif.	McKenzie	Vinson, Ga.
Fay	Magnuson	Vursell
Feighan	Maloney	Wadsworth
Fellows	Manasco	Ward
Fenton	Manfield, Tex.	Wasielewski
Fisher	Martin, Iowa	Weiss
Fitzpatrick	Mason	Wene
Flannagan	May	West
Fogarty	Merritt	Whe'chel, Ga.
Ford	Miller, Pa.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fulbright	Mills	Wolverton, N. J.
Fuller	Morrison, La.	Wright
Fulmer	Morrison, N. C.	
Furlong	Mott	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 242 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. McCORMACK, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following privileged resolution (S. Con. Res. 29), which was read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Tuesday, December 21, 1943, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on the adoption of the concurrent resolution I move the previous question.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognized the majority leader.

Mr. CROSSER. I am opposed to this resolution and I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and forty-two Members have just answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, on the previous question I ask for a division.

The House divided, and there were—ayes 200, noes 17.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECOND SESSION, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 105.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 105), as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress shall begin at noon on Monday, January 10, 1944.

The Senate joint resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOLDIERS' SEPARATION BILL

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire with reference to the so-called soldiers' separation bill. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] understands that I was anxious to have that taken up before Christmas, and I realize he was, too. May I ask him if there is any possibility of it coming up on Monday or Tuesday next?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sorry to say there is no chance.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. In that event, may we have some definite assurance that that bill will be brought to the floor of the House by January 15?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, any definite assurance is dependent upon the committee reporting the bill, but I can assure the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I think I speak the overwhelming sentiment of all the membership of the House, that the bill ought to be out by January 15 and acted upon. I am authorized to make this statement for the Speaker, which is a joint statement of the Speaker and myself, that we will do everything within our power to try and have the Committee on Military Affairs report the bill on or before January 15.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman. I know every Member of this House is anxious to see that full justice is given to the soldiers, and I appreciate the gentleman's answer.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Cali-

fornia [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PREVENTING MONOPOLISTIC ABUSE OF PATENTS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, monopoly now constitutes and will constitute after the war the No. 1 problem of American democracy. For a long time several Members of Congress, including myself, have been making speeches and have introduced a number of bills in an attempt to curb this danger and to help to create a situation in which free enterprise in the real sense of that word will be possible in the America of tomorrow. Many people who talk about free enterprise do not really mean that at all. They mean only that monopoly shall be free from governmental restraint as it gobbles up and destroys smaller business.

Sometime ago I introduced H. R. 1371, a measure aimed to curb some of the worst abuses in connection with patents including their use as a means of restraining trade, throttling competition, and fastening monopolistic control upon whole industries. I am today introducing a revision of that bill and desire to lay before the House briefly its provisions.

The bill consists of five sections amendatory of the Clayton Antitrust Act. These sections would become sections 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31 of the Clayton Act so that the definitions such as those covering antitrust laws, commerce, and other basic matters already contained in the Clayton Act will apply as to these new sections.

SECTION 27

Section 27 follows logically from the very definition of a patent. A patent is an extension by government to a person of certain rights and privileges relative to the patented process which are in and of themselves in the nature of a limitation upon the commerce of the country. This is deemed to be right and proper in order to encourage invention and to give to those responsible for research and invention unusual benefits as a reward for contributions made to human or national welfare. Since, however, this is the nature of a patent, it becomes correspondingly the duty of a government to see that the use of patents is confined to their real purpose and that they do not become in the hands of great corporations instruments for the creation of greater monopolistic control than they would otherwise be able to exercise.

Section 27 authorized the United States to intervene in any action in the Federal courts where the issue of patent infringement is raised, and provides that, upon intervention, the United States shall have all the rights of a party, including rights of appellate review, to present evidence and argument relating to the patents alleged to be infringed. The purpose in allowing such intervention is to provide safeguards against the establishment, in purely private litigation, of spurious or distorted claims of patent privilege.

The provisions of this section correspond closely to those of section 1 of the act of August 24, 1937—28 United States Code, section 401—which authorizes the United States to intervene in any suit

in the Federal courts where the constitutionality of an act of Congress is drawn in question.

Patent litigation is notoriously long drawn out and costly. Most of the patents of large commercial importance are owned by corporations possessing great financial resources and able to command the services of skilled counsel and technical experts. Because of the disadvantages under which the party contesting infringement usually labors, he can frequently be forced into accepting a settlement at some point on the long road of litigation. The result is that many patents and patent claims of doubtful validity are not subjected to the test of judicial scrutiny, particularly by appellate courts, or are not subjected to an adequate test.

In considering the effect of this situation upon the public interest, it must be borne in mind that patent privileges constitute ipso facto a limitation upon freedom of trade and competition. It is therefore a matter of public concern that the special privileges conferred by patent law, which are granted for the sole purpose of stimulating invention, should be confined to their true sphere. In *United States v. Masonite Corporation*, decided May 11, 1942 (316 U. S. 265), the Supreme Court said:

Since patents are privileges restrictive of a free economy, the rights which Congress has attached to them must be strictly construed so as not to derogate from the general law beyond the necessary requirements of the patent statute.

Under existing law the function of the Government in confining patent privileges to their legitimate sphere stops with the issue of the patent—except insofar as the Government, in antitrust proceedings, may attack the misuse of patent claims. Determination of scope and validity, once a patent has been issued, is left to private negotiation and contract and private litigation. For reasons already indicated, there is at present no adequate check upon the misuse of patent rights and claims by large corporations—and sometimes by others—for the purpose of throttling free enterprise or levying tribute upon competitors.

The Government, if allowed to intervene in infringement proceedings, would act as the guardian of the public interest in assuring, so far as possible, that special privileges, which the Government itself has granted for a specific and limited purpose, are kept within their legitimate boundaries. Grant of the power to intervene would not impose any implied obligation to exercise this power in every infringement suit. As a matter of policy, the power would probably be exercised only where the patents involved appeared to be of considerable commercial importance and where there was doubt as to the ability or willingness of the party defending against infringement to litigate the issue effectively and uncompromisingly.

SECTION 28

Section 28 provides that all patent assignments and transfers of rights thereunder shall be in writing and that a copy thereof shall be filed with the Attorney General. Authority is conferred upon

him to issue rules and regulations necessary to carry out the purpose of this section and section 30. The penalty for violation is a monetary fine recoverable by the United States in a civil action. The purpose is to furnish the Government with accurate, up-to-date information as to the actual use being made of patents, in order to facilitate the discovery and the prompt prosecution of violations of the antitrust laws.

The Supreme Court in several recent decisions has passed upon the validity of various patent-licensing arrangements and agreements and has found them unlawful under section 1 of the Sherman Act. There are also numerous cases now pending in court charging similar illegal restraints of trade. In most of these cases the facts which were the basis of suit were discovered only after a long, painstaking, and costly investigation. There are doubtless many other illegal restraints of this nature which have not yet come to the attention of the Government. Furthermore, in practically all of these cases the restraints have been in effect over a long period of time. Eventual discovery of the facts and successful prosecution furnish no relief with respect to the prior period of restraint.

The registration provisions would furnish data which would materially aid the Government in uncovering questionable exercises of the patent privilege and in promptly prosecuting those deemed illegal. The result should be more efficient and more effective enforcement of the antitrust laws in the patent field.

The civil fine, as a sanction for enforcement, is similar to the penalty provided for violation of various provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. See section 1 (17) (a) of that act—49 United States Code, supplement 7, section 1 (17) (a).

This proposed new section 28 of the Clayton Act would apply the same remedy to purely domestic problems as is provided in the field of international cartel agreements by another bill I recently introduced, H. R. 3786. That bill would require all American corporations making cartel agreements with foreign corporations involving production, price, marketing area, patents, or any sort of monopolistic practice to give full facts regarding such contracts or agreements to the Department of Justice. The Attorney General is directed to make such facts available for public inspection. Had the American people known fully about some of the cartel deals made before the war it is doubtful that we would have suffered such restrictions on vitally necessary production as has been the case.

Similarly, if as section 28 would require, everyone knew that all assignments or transfers of patent rights had to be in writing and filed with the Attorney General a great deterrent against harmful action would by this one means be set up.

SECTION 29

Section 29 is the heart of the bill. It reads as follows:

Any use or nonuse of a patent or patent application, or of any interest therein, in-

cluding any failure or refusal to grant licenses thereunder which has the effect of unreasonably limiting the supply of any article in commerce or of unreasonably excluding the supply of any article from commerce is hereby declared to be illegal. Every sale, assignment, or conveyance of a patent or patent application, or of any interest therein, or agreement relating to a patent or patent application, and every transfer of rights under a patent or patent application by license or otherwise, involving any condition, agreement, or understanding which restricts the price of any article sold or handled in commerce and which embodies or is made by the use of an invention covered by such patent or patent application, is hereby declared to be illegal. The use or nonuse of any patent or patent application or of any interest therein in violation of this section shall render such patent or patent application null and void, and any court having jurisdiction of an action, civil or criminal, involving violation of this section shall adjudge that such patent or patent application is null and void. Every person who shall violate this section or who shall engage in any combination or conspiracy to violate this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or by both said punishments in the discretion of the court.

It will be noted that it makes illegal both the use and the nonuse of patents under certain circumstances. It is hardly necessary to emphasize the fact that refusal to permit use of a patented process by a corporation owning right to it may be a restraint on production and commerce of the most far-reaching consequence. We need only remember what has happened in connection with synthetic rubber in the United States within the past very few years to see the importance of this point.

Briefly, this section forbids: First, the use of patents as a means of restricting unreasonably the production of important needed commodities and second, the use of patent agreements, assignments, or leases as a means of controlling prices. The penalty is severe, namely, voidance of the patent itself.

To explain this section a little more fully:

Section 29 makes illegal any use or nonuse of a patent which has the effect of unreasonably limiting the supply of any article in commerce. The purpose of this section is to make it illegal to impose, under the cloak of patent privilege, undue restraints upon production or price competition.

The word "unreasonably" is used so as to make the limitation applicable only if the limitation on supply creates a real bottleneck in production or commerce and is, therefore, actually detrimental to the public. The courts have applied the concept of reasonableness in determining what restraints upon competition—not involving price fixing or boycotts—violate section 1 of the Sherman Act. Any rigid prohibition, with reference to limitation of supply through exercise or nonexercise of patent privilege, is open to objection. Use of the concept of reasonableness provides for flexibility and means that the courts will determine each case of alleged violation in the light of the peculiar facts and circumstances of the particular case.

This prohibition would probably be invoked only infrequently, but its enactment should prove a useful deterrent.

The proposed section also makes it illegal to assign patents or to license rights thereunder involving any condition or agreement which restricts the price of any article which may be produced under the patent. To some extent such conduct may be unlawful under the existing provisions of section 1 of the Sherman Act but it is desirable that the question, as well as the area of illegality, should be definitely fixed by statute.

The above prohibitions would not unduly limit the reward which the patent owner may obtain from his invention. He or his assignee or licensee would still be permitted to sell the patented product at any price he may choose. There would be no impairment of the exclusive right to "make, use, and vend" conferred by the present patent law; the only thing outlawed would be imposition of price restrictions in connection with assigning or granting to others all or part of the owner's patent privilege. Further, there seems no reason in policy for conferring upon the patent owner, in addition to the other privileges which the law grants him, the privilege of price fixing.

The section also provides for the voidance of patents or patent applications, where they have been misused. The additional penalty provided in the case of the new prohibitions, patent forfeiture, cannot be deemed too harsh since it applies only if there has been no advance disclosure of the facts to the Attorney General, as provided in section 30.

SECTION 30

The point may be raised by some that passage of this legislation would make businessmen fearful and would interfere with perfectly proper and even beneficial business arrangements with regard to patented processes.

Section 30, however, provides that there shall be no criminal prosecution or loss of the patent if a full and complete statement of the facts has been submitted to the Attorney General in advance of action and the Attorney General fails within 90 days to issue an opinion holding the proposal to be in violation of section 29. If the Attorney General is of the opinion that the proposal is unlawful, then machinery is afforded the proponent to file a complaint under the Declaratory Judgment Act for a decree declaring the proposal not to be in violation of section 29. If the court should decree that the proposed course of conduct is not in violation of section 29, the Attorney General may request the Court to retain jurisdiction for the purpose of reconsidering at some later date whether the effects resulting from the proposed action are in contravention of the public interest and in violation of section 29.

The Attorney General, however, is not barred from filing an equity suit for violations of section 29 and, of course, where a proponent departs from the provisions of the plan the Attorney General is free to prosecute criminally. This provision generally corresponds to the present policy pursued by the Department of Justice in enforcing the Sherman Act.

In the case of new prohibitions it is proper to make such policy a matter of statutory right, and to enable a proponent to test out in court the legality of a proposed plan in the event of disapproval by the Attorney General.

Thus it may be seen that all anyone would need to do to avoid criminal prosecution under this act would be to make a full statement to the Department of Justice of any proposed negotiations with regard to a patent before such contracts were entered into. Even if the Attorney General ruled against him, he has opportunity to test out in court the legality of his proposed plan.

SECTION 31

Section 31 of the bill is made necessary because in some instances recently the lower courts of the country have refused to permit the Department of Justice to challenge the validity of patents in connection with antitrust suits. Obviously, however, since patents are one of the principal devices used by corporations to establish monopolistic controls, it is a completely unrealistic and impractical situation and one certainly not in the public interest to disbar the Department of Justice from introducing evidence in antitrust suits bearing upon the validity or scope of patent rights.

Section 31, therefore, permits an attack upon the validity and scope of any patent in a proceeding involving a violation of the antitrust laws. Recently in *United States v. United States Gypsum Co.* (D. C. Nov. 1943) the district court refused to admit Government's proof to show invalidity of the patents used by the defendants to support a restrictive licensing structure on the ground that the Government in antitrust actions could not attack validity of patents. Yet in the case of *Sola Electric Co. v. Jefferson Electric Co.* (317 U. D. 173, Dec. 7, 1942), the Supreme Court held that a patent licensee, by virtue of his license agreement, is not estopped to challenge a price-fixing clause in the agreement by showing that the patent is invalid, and that the price restrictions would be accordingly unlawful because not protected by the patent monopoly. In reaching this conclusion, the court argued that local rules of estoppel which would fasten upon the public the burden of an agreement in violation of the Sherman Act must yield to the Sherman Act's declaration that such agreements are unlawful, and to the public policy of the act, which in the public interest, precludes the enforcement of such unlawful agreements.

The principal purpose of section 31 is to enable the Government—and plaintiffs in treble damage suits—to attack the validity and scope of patents in antitrust litigation. In following the reasoning of the Supreme Court in the *Jefferson Electric* case, that every patent grant is a restraint on competition, this section would also permit a party to show the invalidity or limited scope of any patent in any action involving a patent or any interest therein.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ad-

dress the House on Tuesday next for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KELLEY (at the request of Mr. EBERHARTER), for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. ROWE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. JEFFREY (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois, and to Mr. RIZLEY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinitely, on account of illness.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1543. An act to provide for mustering-out payments to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1169. An act for the relief of Samuel Margolin.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, December 20, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

974. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 76 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 386. Resolution authorizing the employment of counsel to represent Congress in certain litigation brought by Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett; without amendment (Rept. No. 967). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 387. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred in connection with House Resolution 386 and of further proceedings under House Resolution 105; without

amendment (Rept. No. 963). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 389. Resolution providing additional funds for the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities in the United States, and related questions; without amendment (Rept. No. 969). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 359. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the bill entitled "The Revenue Act of 1943," and the accompanying report thereon; without amendment (Rept. No. 970). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 384. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings on the bill (H. R. 2857) to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 971). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 380. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the second intermediate report (H. Rept. No. 862) of the Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 972). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 370. Resolution authorizing that House Document No. 351, being the press releases of the Department of State containing the declaration of four nations on general security, pledging themselves to united action for the prosecution of the present war against their enemies, which was signed at the conference held at Moscow, Russia, together with other papers relating thereto, be reprinted with corrections conforming to the official texts now on file in the Department of State; without amendment (Rept. No. 973). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 1488. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Jose C. Romero, all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain described tract of land within the Carson National Forest, N. Mex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 974). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURCH of Virginia:
H. R. 3870. A bill to amend section 214 of the act of February 28, 1925; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. COSTELLO:
H. R. 3871. A bill providing for the retirement of certain officers of the regular armed forces previously retired for physical disability; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLIE:
H. R. 3872. A bill to remove for the duration of the war certain limitations upon the appointment and compensation of retired commissioned officers employed in civilian positions by the Government; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 3873. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act by adding a new title thereto relating to the sale or other disposition of surplus property of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 3874. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 3875. A bill to grant to enlisted personnel in the land or naval forces and to Army and Navy nurses certain benefits with respect to accumulated leave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. R. 3876. A bill to provide a method of voting, during the period of the war and 6 months thereafter, by members of the armed forces absent from the place of their residence; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution extending until January 31, 1944, the provisions of the act of April 29, 1943, making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 3877. A bill for the relief of Clara E. Deane; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 3878. A bill for the relief of Clara E. Deane; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 3879. A bill granting a pension to Clara E. Deane; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 3880. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Zukas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 3881. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Chandler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3882. A bill for the relief of C. Guy Evans; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SASSER:

H. R. 3883. A bill granting a pension to Ella G. West; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4148. By Mr. HALE: Petition of the Cumberland County (Maine) Council of the American Legion, that the Congress of the United States authorize the War Department to issue some method of identification to those inductees who have been requested by their respective draft boards to report for induction and have been rejected for physical disability and prevented from entering the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4149. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4150. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Delta Council, Stoneville, Miss., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to favoring enactment of legislation levying a Federal retail and wholesale sales tax to be designated as a "war tax" at such rate or rates as will produce revenues sufficient to pay as we go an appreciable part of the expense incurred in prosecuting the

war, in which we are engaged against the Axis Powers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4151. Also, petition of R. L. Scott, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Treasury check No. 9,505,866; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we praise Thee for the advent of the world's Redeemer; for His serene nature and for His all-encompassing sympathy. All things abide in Him, measuring out our golden years and giving us the full knowledge of our God. O let the wounded, the bruised, and the suffering take renewed comfort in His blessed promises. "Strengthen ye the weak hands and confirm the feeble knees. * * * In the wilderness shall waters break out and streams in the desert. An highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called the way of holiness."

On this earth is a staggering load of war; the scorpion whip of slavery and murder is in the deadly hands of conscienceless men. Upon the relentless darkness of this world we pray that the spirit of the Christ may rise in all its full-orbed glory. Help us to rise ever higher, going from strength to strength, from nobility to nobility, and to become more just, more beneficent, and over the fields of human life to have an equitable regard for human rights. O forgive America's indulgence and self-enjoyment and lift up our words, thoughts, and deeds that the angels' song shall out sing the rewards of man. O the exhaustless bounty and power of Him who loved us for His own name's sake. Not unto us but unto Thy name be the praise of our salvation forever and ever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, December 18, 1943, was read and approved.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the calling of the Consent Calendar be dispensed with today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the calling of the Private Calendar on tomorrow be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the completion of the business on the Speaker's desk and other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on veterans in the Record, and also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a letter and a newspaper clipping concerning Montana Bill Musgrove.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISBURSING OFFICE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 390) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 1, 1944, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, an additional sum not to exceed \$2,500 during a fiscal year for the employment of professional and other necessary help in the disbursing office in accordance with the provisions of House Resolution No. 585, adopted December 16, 1942.

Sec. 2. That effective January 1, 1944, there shall also be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, additional compensation to the Disbursing Clerk of the House, at the rate of \$1,000 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVISED EDITION OF CANNON'S PROCEDURE

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report an original privileged joint resolution (H. J. Res. 210) authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed and bound for the use of the House 1,500 copies of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives by CLARENCE CANNON, to be printed under the supervision of the author and to be distributed to the Members by the Speaker.

Sec. 2. That notwithstanding any provision of the copyright laws and regulations with respect to publications in the public domain, such revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives shall be subject to copyright by the author thereof.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand we gave this authorization last year and this is merely an amendment that you are adding on with reference to the copyright.

Mr. JARMAN. The copyright; that is all.